

CONFIDENTIAL

COMMUNIST REVISIONISM AND DISSIDENCE (2)

This report contains material on Communist revisionism and dissidence as reflected in Communist and non-Communist sources. The latest source date used herein is 28 June 1960.

Table of Contents

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Part 1. USSR | 1 |
| Revisionism in the USSR | 1 |
| Part 2. Far East | 4 |
| I. China | 4 |
| A. Campaign Method | 6 |
| B. Development of the Issue | 10 |
| C. Chinese Charge of Revisionist Errors | 17 |
| D. Bloc Unity and Criticism of China | 32 |
| II. Indonesia | 36 |
| Party Reaction to Moscow-Peiping Dispute | 36 |
| III. Outer Mongolia | 43 |
| Press Reprints Antirevisionist Articles From Foreign Sources | 43 |
| IV. North Vietnam | 44 |
| Peiping-Moscow Differences Ignored in Press | 44 |
| Part 3. Eastern Europe | 47 |
| I. Bulgaria | 47 |
| II. East Germany | 47 |
| III. Hungary | 47 |
| Hungarian Attacks on Modernism May Be Motivated Partly by Fears of Yugoslav Revisionism | 47 |

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| IV. Rumania | <u>Page</u> 49 |
| Press Elaborates on Soviet Attack on Yugoslav Revisionism | 49 |
| Part 4. Western Europe | 53 |
| Belgium | 53 |
| Belgian Communist Party Accused of Opportunism; Politburo Member Admits Dogmatism Hinders Building of Socialism | 53 |

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Part 1. USSR

Revisionism in the USSR

The cyclic pattern of a monolithic state perpetuating its pyramidal structure is again clearly seen in the Soviet Union, for revisionism has reappeared in the USSR. As in 1956, however, its origin stems from the top of the structure. Current revisionism in the USSR is, in reality, an extension of the modifications of Lenin's doctrine on war and peace adopted at the 20th and 21st party congresses. Revisionism in the USSR today constitutes Khrushchev's reaffirmation of his interpretation of Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist teachings on the inevitability of war and Lenin's doctrine on the methods used for the seizure of power, i.e., revolution by violence. Both of these interpretations revolve around the adoption of the principle of peaceful coexistence and disarmament even though "Western imperialism and capitalist encirclement" still exist.

The fact that Lenin's theses on the inevitability of war, disarmament, and "peaceful coexistence," quoted below, have been questioned and changed is, in itself, the height of revisionism.

In 1915 Lenin wrote: "War is simply the continuation of politics by other (i.e., violent) means. This formula belongs to Clausewitz, one of the greatest writers on the history of war, whose ideas were fertilized by Hegel. And this was always the standpoint of Marx and Engels, who regarded every war as the continuation of the politics of the given interested powers...and the various classes within these countries...." (Selected Works, London, 1936, Vol 5, pp 179-180)

In 1917 Lenin wrote: "We are not pacifists. We are opposed to imperialist wars for the division of spoils among the capitalists, but we have always declared it to be absurd for the revolutionary proletariat to renounce revolutionary wars that may prove necessary in the interests of socialism...." (Selected Works, New York, 1943, Vol 5, p 143) And: "Socialists, without ceasing to be socialists, cannot oppose any kind of war...." (Collected Works, New York, 1942, Vol 19, p 362)

Again in 1917 Lenin declared: "Imperialism, or the epoch of finance capital, represents a high stage of development of the capitalist economic system, one in which monopolist associations of capitalists -- syndicates, cartels, and trusts -- have assumed decisive importance. Imperialist wars, i.e., wars for the mastery of the world, for markets, for bank capital and for the strangulation of small and weak nations, are inevitable under such a state of affairs...." (Selected Works, New York, 1943, Vol 6, p 110)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Stalin reaffirmed the doctrine of the inevitability of war: "We cannot forget the saying of Lenin to the effect that a great deal depends, in the matter of our construction, on whether we succeed in delaying war with the capitalist countries, which is inevitable but which may be delayed, either until proletarian revolution ripens in Europe or until the colonial revolutions come fully to a head, or finally, until the capitalists fight among themselves over division of the colonies...." (Collected Works), New York, 1953, Vol 10, p 288)

On disarmament Lenin wrote: "The arming of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat is one of the greatest, fundamental, and most important facts of modern capitalist society.... but only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie can it, without betraying its world-historical problem, throw to the scrap pile all kinds of armaments in general -- and the proletariat will doubtless do it -- but only then, and by no means before...." (Collected Works, New York, 1942, Vol 19, p 363)

And on peaceful coexistence Lenin taught: "As long as capitalism and socialism exist, we cannot live in peace; in the end, one or the other will triumph...." (Selected Works, New York, 1943, Vol 8, p 297)

Khrushchev has challenged these statements. Basing his interpretations on the fact that some of Lenin's teachings are outdated and should be considered in the light of present world conditions, Khrushchev in his speech at the Third Rumanian Party Congress stated that the Soviet Union would continue to pursue the policy of peaceful coexistence as adopted at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, and that: "We cannot repeat today mechanically what Vladimir Il'ich Lenin said many decades ago about imperialism and always repeat that imperialist wars are inevitable as long as socialism has not triumphed all over the world.... We live in a time when we no longer have Marx, Engels, or Lenin with us. If we act like children who, studying the alphabet, compile words from letters, we shall not go very far.... All this entitles us to assert with certainty that under present conditions war is not inevitable. He who does not understand this does not believe in the force and creative possibilities of the working class, underestimates the strength of the socialist camp, and has no confidence in the great attractive force of socialism, which has manifestly demonstrated its superiority over capitalism...." (Pravda, 22 June 1960)

Khrushchev's 18 September 1959 speech at the General Assembly of the United Nations (Pravda, 19 September 1959) concerning general and complete disarmament by all governments was a direct challenge to the validity of Lenin's teachings on disarmament. Likewise, Khrushchev stated "Socialism and capitalism exist on the same planet and their coexistence is historically inevitable. We stand for the policy of peaceful coexistence with capitalist countries and we favor both bilateral agreements in the interests of consolidation of peace and agreements on collective security in Europe and Asia...." (Pravda, 7 November 1957) This was a direct contradiction of Lenin's thesis concerning the impossibility of peace between capitalism and socialism.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Khrushchev, adopting a practical position, justifies his revisionist theses by stating: "Based on the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, we must think for ourselves; we must thoroughly study life, analyze the present situation, and draw conclusions that are useful to the common cause of Communism...." (Pravda, 22 June 1960)

The CPSU and its leaders, supporting Khrushchev's revisionist proclamations, have endeavored to point out that his theses on peaceful coexistence, disarmament, and the noninevitability of war are not new theses, for Lenin had maintained the same theses following the Civil War and was always in favor of peaceful coexistence. In confirmation of this, Pravda on 23 April 1960 published a speech by O. V. Kuusinen, member of the Presidium of the CPSU, dedicated to the 90th anniversary of Lenin's birth, in which Kuusinen stated: "Now in the West there are glib publicists who allege that Lenin was against peaceful coexistence of the two systems. These falsifiers snatch out separate quotations from Lenin's works, or even bits of quotations dating back to the time of the Civil War and military intervention. But it was the world bourgeoisie itself that, by its intervention, lent to the struggle of the Russian proletariat the character of an international clash. It is clear that at the time of the intervention the question of peaceful coexistence of socialism and capitalism was relegated to the background.... The principles of peaceful coexistence, both then and now, form the basis of the entire Soviet foreign policy. In the course of recent years our party has been creatively developing this idea of Lenin. Of decisive importance in this respect was the conclusion drawn by the 20th and 21st party congresses about the absence of the fatal inevitability of wars in our epoch, about the possibility of preventing wars. By drawing this conclusion the party has made a new contribution to Marxism.... Therefore, to be loyal to Marxism-Leninism today it is not sufficient to repeat the old truth that imperialism is aggressive. The task is to make full use of the new factors acting for peace in order to save humanity from the catastrophe of another war. A dogmatic position is a backward position...."

Party periodicals have also supported Khrushchev. Issue No 6, April 1960, of Kommunist, chief theoretical organ of the CPSU, published an article entitled "Creation of Leninist Genius" by I. Pomelov, in which the author states: "The Communist Party [of the Soviet Union] should be sufficiently flexible to change its direction or fit any given concrete situation even if some of its general principles have to be altered...."

The above-mentioned speeches and articles have been published, apparently, to prove that Khrushchev's theses on peaceful coexistence, disarmament, and the noninevitability of war are valid interpretations of Lenin's theses and are not revisionistic. According to the Soviet press, revisionism is a movement which contradicts the current valid interpretations of Marxism-Leninism, and is against Soviet foreign and domestic policies. Of the scores of articles which have been published in the Soviet press attacking this movement, some examples are listed below.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

O. P. Goncharov, "Marxism and Contemporary Revisionism in the Correlation of Politics and Economics," Uchenyye Zapiski (Tadzhikistanskiy Universitet), Vol 24, No 3, 1959, pp 44-78

Kh. Momdzhyan, "Further Shift to the Right in the Ideology of Contemporary Reformism," Kommunist, No 3, February 1960, pp 84-99

B. Ponomarev, F. Konstantinov, and Yu. Andropov, "On the Old Revisionist Positions," Kommunist, No 8, May 1960, pp 24-28

N. S. Shishkin, "For the Offensive Criticism of the Bourgeois Ideology and Revisionism," Vestnik Vysshey Shkoly, No 4, April 1960, pp 80-84

V. Shishkina, "Contemporary Marxist Thought on the Struggle With Bourgeois Philosophy, Revisionism, and Dogmatism," Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta (Seriya 8, Ekonomika, Filosofiya), No 2, March-April 1960, pp 87-90

Z. N. Meleshchenko, "Philosophic and Social-Political Views of F. Lassalle and Contemporary Revisionism," Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta (Seriya Ekonomiki, Filosofii i Prava), No 5, Issue 1, 1960, pp 76-87

E. Bagramov, "Lenin's Principles of Party-Mindedness and the Struggle Against Contemporary Bourgeois Ideology," Politicheskoye Samoobrazovaniye, No 4, April 1960, pp 41-53

B. D. Bayer and Z. A. Ginzburg, "Contemporary Revisionism, Its Sources and Fundamental Characteristics," Nauchnyye Trudy (Samarkandskiy Meditsinskiy Institut), Vol 17, 1960, pp 55-74

Part 2. FAR EAST

I. CHINA

Issue of "Revisionism" in Sino-Soviet Dispute of 1960

The Chinese-Soviet disagreement regarding accommodation with the West was revealed in numerous articles and editorials published in the Chinese Communist press, but especially in the semimonthly Hung-ch'i, the theoretical journal of the Chinese Communist Party, and in Jen-min Jih-pao, the leading Peiping daily newspaper. During the period mid-April through 7 July 1960, the Chinese press surveyed for this publication employed the term "revisionism" more often than at any time since the bloc dispute over the Yugoslav party program in early 1958.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

The term was injected as an ideological superweapon into what was essentially a practical policy argument, and only after that argument had run a good part of its course and was already heavily armed with basic Leninist theory. The charge "revisionist," first appeared, ostensibly with reference to Yugoslavia, in Hung-ch'i on 16 April 1960. (See Summary No 2622, Communist Revisionism and Dissidence (1).)

The differences in these two regimes' approaches to the conduct of the bloc's relations with the West had begun to emerge clearly in Chinese publications 6 months before, during the Chinese Communists' celebration of their tenth anniversary, in October 1959. Khrushchev arrived in Peiping for the anniversary, immediately following his trip to the US, at a time when the Chinese press was assessing Communist China's progress and world position and attributing its achievements to 10 years of correctness in party line and policy. At this time the press was also engaged in countering internal "right opportunism" and tendencies toward relaxation in the conduct of the regime's strenuous domestic programs. The issue of detente with the West which then arose came under discussion in the press, with references to the true nature of imperialism" and "the unshakable nature of Sino-Soviet unity," and expressions of "approval" of Soviet efforts to achieve a relaxation of international tension. At the Warsaw Pact Conference in Moscow in early February, Chinese Politburo representative K'ang Sheng asserted that revisionism was the principal danger to the Communist movement and that the Chinese party considered it necessary to struggle resolutely against it. All this was accompanied by emphasis in the Chinese press on the correctness of Mao Tse-tung's policies and his status as a theoretician.

The issue sharpened in Chinese publications with the approach of the summit meeting, when the press began to grow openly argumentative, though the argument was confined to pointing out the impossibility of dealing with imperialism and the inevitability of war. In this form it reached a peak in the 1 April Hung-ch'i, in an article by Yu Chao-li which quoted from Communist classics to prove these points.

Beginning in mid-April, a month before the summit meeting, the tone of editorials and speeches became virulent. Where imperialist war had been the target and reasoning the method, the Chinese now attacked those who ignored their patient instruction in the basic Marxist-Leninist truth of the world situation. The press introduced, the charge of revisionism of Marxism-Leninism, and during the entire month before the summit meeting, periodicals and papers brought this to bear, together with the previous argument, on the Soviet Union. The Presidium of the CPSU replied on the Lenin anniversary, 22 April, in a speech by Kuusinen challenging the correctness of Chinese interpretation of Marxism-Leninism.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

The Chinese party's charge of revisionism, its press shows, resulted from its apprehension over what would happen to it and to the Communist movement if a relaxation of tension were brought about by negotiation.

The Chinese press labeled as "revisionist" those who doubt the outcome of the world struggle and are discouraged with its progress. According to the press, the revisionists "see Marxism-Leninism as outmoded in the modern world and as having lost its significance for social progress. They feel the socialist system need not be further developed, but only consolidated, and see no internal contradictions in socialist society; thus they rely only on development of technique, not on political struggle. They attack China on the question of the transitional nature of socialist society and the need for uninterrupted revolution toward the goal of Communism. They regard the world as having entered a new epoch in which proletarian revolution is no longer applicable, and think that imperialism will withdraw from the contest on its own, bringing peace without revolution. Imperialism, they say, has abandoned its war policy, thus Lenin's analysis of imperialism no longer applies. Much of this the revisionists have concluded because of their fear of nuclear war, which makes them want to temper their own revolution and the spread of revolution among others."

Along with these charges, the Chinese press repeatedly proclaimed the beliefs of true Marxist-Leninists (i.e., the Chinese), a subject which occupied by far the greater amount of space. Marxism-Leninism teaches, it said, that: imperialists will never change, and that an end to imperialist war is possible only by struggling against imperialism and war and by developing revolution; the socialist camp is now the stronger, and can force the capitalist camp into peace; the new epoch is one favorable for proletarian revolution in the world and national revolution in the colonies. Thus, it said, what is needed is "a proletarian revolutionary party of tempered steel, which struggles and which mobilizes the revolutionary spirit of the masses."

A. Campaign Method

1. Marxist-Leninist vs Revisionist

For the conduct of their campaign to counter the "revisionist" ideas which they saw as leading to the detente that they desired to prevent, the Chinese set up a duality in the Communist world, wherein, they held, there exist two kinds of people, Marxist-Leninists and revisionists, one correct in its interpretation of contemporary reality and the other wrong.

This approach was exemplified in the speech by Lu Ting-yi, party politburo member, at the Lenin anniversary celebration in Peiping, as reported by Jen-min Jih-pao on 23 April 1960. Lu made it clear that the Chinese are the exemplars of Marxism-Leninism. Regarding revisionism, he merely itemized the actions and positions which were in fact those of the Soviet Union. His technique was alternately to present what "Marxist-Leninists maintain," and what "modern revisionists maintain."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Taking note of the "situation of the new epoch" in which "the collapse of imperialism is accelerated and there is a continual increase in victories and in awakening," he stated: "Marxist-Leninists and modern revisionists, working from basically different stands, draw fundamentally different conclusions from this situation." The former, he said, see it as unprecedentedly favorable for proletarian revolution throughout the world and national revolution in the colonies. He asserted that the forces of peace have grown to where there is now the practical possibility of preventing war; thus the people must intensify the struggle against imperialism and develop revolution, to defend world peace.

"But the modern revisionists," he continued, "see it as a new epoch in which proletarian revolution in various countries, and national revolution in the colonies, disappear from the world program." They think imperialism will withdraw of its own accord, without revolution, and lasting peace will come without anti-imperialist struggle, he said. Thus, whether to conduct revolution and oppose imperialism "have become matters of fundamental difference" between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism.

Lu set up as a guidepost for the dispute the same contention which had been made in the Moscow Declaration of Communist Parties in 1957: "At present, modern revisionism is the chief danger to the international Communist movement. It is our sacred duty fully to utilize the Leninist revolutionary spirit in thoroughly exposing the true nature of this agent of imperialism -- modern revisionism."

In making this statement, Lu was echoing the editorial in Hung-ch'i, 16 April, which had insisted on the retention of revisionism, "or in other words, right opportunism," in the position of official main danger to the international Communist movement. Citing the Moscow Declaration to this effect, it said: "Some say this judgement of the Moscow meeting no longer applies under present conditions, but we believe that opinion to be wrong; it will make the people overlook the importance of struggle against the main danger, revisionism, and greatly damage the revolutionary cause of the proletariat.... Under circumstances when the imperialists are compelled to accept peaceful coexistence and there exists a kind of 'domestic peace' in many capitalist countries, revisionist tendencies easily grow and spread. We must, therefore, constantly maintain high vigilance against this main danger to the workers movement."

2. Lenin the Criterion

The Chinese selected Lenin as the criterion for present-day Marxist-Leninists and for the purposes of this dispute. Jen-min Jih-pao, 23 April 1960, reported that Lu Ting-yi, in his speech at the Lenin anniversary meeting, said: "Leninism is the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution" (a formula which was repeated in a Jen-min Jih-pao editorial on the same day).

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Throughout his speech, Lu applied the Lenin criterion to the conduct of affairs in the history of the Soviet and Chinese parties. Lenin himself, he said, had led the working people, smashing imperialist armed intervention and counterrevolution, and had pointed the road to socialist construction. After his death, "the Central Committee and Soviet government, headed by Stalin, led the people in putting into practice Lenin's instructions," so that the Soviet Union was speedily built into a powerful socialist country and had furthered the cause of proletarian revolution and made exceptional contributions to world peace, Lu said. But when he came to the Khrushchev era, Lu said only that the Soviet Union had now entered the period of building a Communist society and had made brilliant scientific and economic achievements, under the leadership of the Central Committee and Soviet government headed by Comrade Khrushchev; he did not mention Leninism in this connection. (According to the Jen-min Jih-pao article, this speech was given while Soviet Ambassador Chervenko was on the rostrum, together with envoys from the other Bloc countries.)

In all subsequent editorials and speeches on the dispute, the Chinese quoted liberally from Lenin, supporting every point with statements from his works and examples from international practice which they said had borne him out. An editorial in Jen-min Jih-pao on the Lenin anniversary, 22 April, noted that the Chinese feel Lenin's theory and cause to be very close to them because it was from Leninism that they found their way to liberation, and it was Lenin who repeatedly pointed out the great significance and future of the Chinese revolutionary struggle.

Perhaps the bulk of editorial space was given to a review and explanation of the fundamentals of Leninist and Marxist theory, as it applied to the Chinese argument. The editorials quoted from Lenin's writings, elaborated in their own words, and called up supporting examples from past and recent history. It may have been in response to this that Khrushchev chose his words at the Rumanian party congress on 21 June: "We cannot repeat mechanically today what V. I. Lenin said many decades ago about imperialism, continually repeating that imperialist wars are inevitable as long as socialism has not triumphed all over the world.... If we act like children studying the alphabet who compile words from letters, we shall not go very far. Based on Marxist-Leninist teachings, we must think for ourselves...."

3. Moscow Declaration of 1957

The other outstanding documentary authority to which the Chinese appealed in some editorials was the Moscow Declaration of Communist and Workers Parties of November 1957. Mainly it was invoked to defend the general validity of Marxism-Leninism today, and to condemn modern revisionism. Thus the Chinese brought to bear against the Soviets a document to which the Soviets themselves were only recently the principal party. As reported in Jen-min Jih-pao of 23 April, Lu Ting-yi said, in his Lenin anniversary speech, "The

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

declaration of the Moscow meeting is the program of the international Communist movement of our time, as acknowledged by the Communist and workers parties of various nations. The Chinese Communist Party, together with the parties of the other countries, faithfully adhere to and are carrying out this great program."

In the early days of their antidetente effort, the Chinese quoted in detail from the Moscow Declaration, which had been drawn up when both the Soviets and the Chinese were emerging from unpleasant experiences with policies of relaxation and were in agreement on a harder more orthodox line, both domestically and internationally. As a result, the bulk of the declaration tends to support the current Chinese approach, though both parties to the dispute have cited the declaration selectively.

4. Yugoslavia's Tito Cited

At times the discussion of revisionism seemed to veer away from matters having to do with widely publicized Soviet policy, and in several instances the Chinese seemed to be railing against actual abuses and errors by Tito; but for the most part their fire was directed at known Soviet attitudes. If in all cases the Chinese were not referring directly to the Soviets in using such terms as "the traitor face of the modern revisionists," the press made it clear that they were concerned with the influence of Yugoslav revisionist concepts of the world on the Soviets and others in the Communist world. At first, the Chinese cited Tito as their revisionist target, while dealing in substance with all those disturbing aspects of bloc events which obviously involved the Soviet Union. The editorial in Hung-ch'i of 16 April for example, referred frequently to Tito revisionism and discussed questionable points in the Yugoslav party's program. This, however, lasted only a week; on 22 April, the Lenin anniversary, they dropped this gesture and, until well after the summit conference collapsed on 16 May, used the term "modern revisionists" or, more rarely, "those who are not really revisionists but are only temporarily deluded."

By June, the Chinese had resumed occasional use of Tito as ostensible target, and as the month progressed, tended to retreat more and more under this cover. In a speech to a delegation from the Albanian party, as reported in Jen-min Jih-pao, 4 June, Liu Shao-chi noted that that party had held to Marxism-Leninism and dealt blows to "the provocations and subversive activities of the Yugoslav modern revisionists and thoroughly exposed the ugly features of the Tito clique as agents of imperialism" (the wording of this was probably tailored in part to the particular situation of the Albanian-Yugoslav relationship). A 12 June Jen-min Jih-pao editorial used the phrase, "the modern revisionists represented by the Tito clique." Chang Chi-chun, in a speech published in the same issue, used the formulation, "In this new historic epoch the modern revisionists have appeared, with the Tito clique as their representative." The term "imperialism and its lackeys" was used frequently. One version, given by Chang Chi-chun, read: "The modern revisionists, represented by the Tito clique of Yugoslavia, are the lackeys serving the interests of imperialism."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

In 16 June editorial in Hung-chi, the Chinese reacted more openly to Soviet intentions than at any point previously, although they worded the introductory paragraphs more carefully than ever with references to Yugoslav revisionism; here for the first time they took as a starting point the position that it was the Yugoslavs who had done the damage; they spoke against the deeds of "the faithful lackeys of imperialism, the Yugoslav modern revisionists" and "the despicable lies of the Yugoslav modern revisionists," but the bulk of the editorial was devoid of such references and was clearly not addressed to these particular revisionists.

5. Historical Revisionists Cited

To add weight to their discussion of revisionism in the Communist world today, some editorials and speeches briefly reviewed the history of revisionism as it applied to current issues. Discussing the proletarian revolutionary character of Leninism, for example, Lu Ting-yi, in his Lenin Day speech (reported in Jen-min Jih-pao, 23 April), recalled how Lenin had revived the revolutionary content and restored the revolutionary keenness of Marxism, which had been emasculated by the revisionists of the Second International. He spoke of how Lenin, at the end of the 19th Century, analyzed the essential nature of imperialism, the then new stage of capitalism, and thoroughly refuted Bernstein's and Kautsky's whitewashing of imperialism. Thrown into panic by the seeming power of imperialism then, the opportunists of the Second International were bought out by the bourgeoisie and catered to imperialism, he said, and in keeping with its interests spread reformist and capitulationist influences among the masses, opposed the revolution, and supported the imperialist World War I.

The campaign's lead-off editorial, in Hung-ch'i, 16 April, made a direct comparison: "The word 'peace' as mouthed by the modern revisionists is used to gloss over the imperialists' preparations for war, playing once more the old theme of ultraimperialism of the old opportunists, long since refuted by Lenin."

B. Development of the Issue

On 16 April, when the editorial in Hung-ch'i first attacked "revisionism," the Chinese Communist Party also carried its message of opposition to revisionism directly to the Communist world outside the bloc, through speeches by Central Committee representatives three Communist Party congresses then being held in different parts of the world. The Chinese party's interpretation of the world situation and policy for the Communist movement was delivered in Belgium by Lin Tieh, in New Zealand by Chen Yu, and in Finland by Wu Chih-pu, according to Jen-min Jih-pao of 17 April 1960.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

The paper reported that the Belgians were told: "Imperialism is still utilizing modern revisionism to undermine the great unity of the international Communist movement; thus, modern revisionism is still the main danger to that movement. The declaration of November 1957 of the Moscow meeting of Communist and workers parties constitutes a historically important program for the current struggle of the international working class. It has become a powerful weapon for strengthening the unity of international Communism and the victory over imperialism and its tool, revisionism. It leads us to unity and continuous victory in the unrelenting struggle against revisionism...." For the New Zealand party, the message was tailored to their local situation: "Three years ago your party, under the leadership of its national committee, succeeded in smashing the vicious assault of the revisionists against your party and in defending the principles of Marxism-Leninism. By means of this struggle you have strengthened your internal unity and your party's unity with the international Communist movement. Your party's achievements in recent years are closely related to its successful struggle against revisionism."

From mid-April to the end of June, the Chinese press approach to this question fluctuated in response to events and apparent shifts which these brought in Soviet attitudes toward detente efforts. At several points where the Chinese considered detente developments favorable, the question of revisionism was omitted from editorials on these developments and they contented themselves with general rejoicing and reminders of the international truths as the Chinese had been preaching then.

The first such development was Khrushchev's condemnation, before the Supreme Soviet, of the U-2 flight over the Soviet Union. Jen-min Jih-pao of 9 May made no comment on revisionist errors, but expressed full agreement with Khrushchev's "solemn and just stand on the international situation" and vindicated Chinese correctness on this subject. The hope and efforts for peace, it said, should not be seen as begging for peace or as fear of war or weakness.

As the summit meeting convened, Jen-min Jih-pao's editorial of 16 May "firmly supported" the "positive attitude of the Soviets in undertaking to ease tensions," making no reference to revisionism. It attributed the holding of the meeting to victory in the struggle of the people for lessening tension, claiming the US was compelled to accept it as a result. The Chinese supported it, according to the editorial, "no matter whether this kind of meeting achieves anything." It added that while hoping for useful contributions, the people would have no illusions about "imperialism and the US."

The press reaction to the collapse of the summit was similarly reserved. Neither the speech made by party Secretary General Teng Hsiao-ping at a rally condemning the US nor the 21 May Jen-min Jih-pao editorial on the event mentioned revisionism. Teng's speech, reported in the same issue of this paper, stressed the impossibility of negotiations which are "doomed to failure

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

because of the imperialists' refusal," and said: "This cannot damage us; it can only expose them and thereby educate the masses of people in the world... We have never held illusions that lasting peace can be achieved through negotiations alone." World peace, he noted, relies mainly on struggle by the people of the world.

However, Teng did make interesting use of an epithet which had previously been applied to the "revisionists," when he said that should the Soviets under present circumstances participate in negotiations which are doomed to failure, they would become "accomplices" in attempts to deceive the people. "But the Soviet government does not wish to become an accomplice," he asserted. "Its struggle carried out directly against US imperialism...inspires the peace-loving people of the world and is cheered and supported by them and the socialist countries." Britain and France he described as accomplices in the US crime of sabotaging the conference, and added that "the US imperialists and their accomplices" were using every propaganda means to confuse world opinion on their espionage flights.

The editorial on the summit collapse spoke only along the line that there was nothing strange in this development to those who see the international situation from a viewpoint of class analysis and are not misled by superficial events, and who understand the nature of imperialism. Such further exposure of imperialism, it said, would help world peace and progress, and enable the people to learn "the true nature of imperialism" and to unite more closely "to struggle against its policies of aggression and for peace." Because failure to reach an agreement opens the eyes of the people, it said, the Chinese favored all kinds of talks.

On 28 May, the Jen-min Jih-pao editorial on President Eisenhower's speech explaining the U-2 incident mentioned that Marxist-Leninists see that imperialism will never change its nature, and that only struggle against it can preserve peace.

An important juncture in the dispute, for the Chinese, was the meeting in Peiping of the World Federation of Trade Unions general council in early June. They used this forum to detail their interpretation of the international situation and the role of the "revisionists" in it, before an audience of representatives from throughout the Communist world. After the Soviet representative and a number of Chinese speakers had made their positions known, the general resolution of the session gave basic support to the Soviet view and made no mention of "revisionism." Item 1 of the resolution, which was published in Jen-min Jih-pao of 10 June, observed that "objective conditions exist which favor the strengthening of the united struggle of the workers to force the imperialists to enter serious negotiations and accept disarmament and peaceful coexistence, in order to eliminate the danger of an atomic world war." Item 1 supported the Chinese view only up to the words "serious negotiations."

The same issue of Jen-min Jih-pao devoted an editorial to pressing the need for struggle and revolution among the world's working class, and complained that "the modern revisionists are splitting the international workers movement under the cloak of Marxism-Leninism" and clouding the line between the enemy and the people in an effort to end revolutionary struggle. Because of this attempt to wreck working class unity, it said, the task of the world's working class was to smash modern revisionist intrigues.

By mid-June, a month after the abortive summit meeting, Khrushchev had made it clear that a change of fundamental policy had not taken place and that the Soviet intention was still to seek detente. Hung-ch'i, 16 June, marked the Chinese recognition of this fact with a sharp lesson on revisionism and imperialism. The editorial began: "In the past month or two, a series of heartening changes have occurred in the world, which have delivered another blow to the imperialist policies of aggression and war and shattered the various fallacies put forth in imperialism's defense by the modern revisionists.... When the inner logic of historical development emerges with the rising surge of class struggle, the true features of the modern revisionists become exposed with increasing clarity."

Throughout, the editorial attributed the origin of all misconceptions of the international situation and betrayal of Marxism-Leninism to "the Yugoslav modern revisionists," but it said: "One cannot draw a clean dividing line between oneself and modern revisionism, which serves imperialism, simply by admitting that the forces of socialism today surpass those of imperialism.... The modern revisionists themselves admit this verbally, but added the point that the nature of imperialism has been, or can be, changed and that many imperialist politicians have taken a positive direction and are no longer unreasonably opposed to peace.... It is very clear that those who yield even slightly to such a modern revisionist fallacy are in danger of falling into the quicksand of revisionism themselves. This fallacy, spread by the Yugoslav modern revisionists, to the effect that the nature of imperialism has changed, has already confused and misled some people and given them illusions about imperialism. For Marxist-Leninists it has become an urgent, fighting task to expose these lies of the Yugoslav modern revisionists and help those who are bewildered or who hold illusions to gradually regain their balance." This marked the first time, in the sources surveyed, that the Chinese had spoken directly and at this length about "those under the influence of the revisionists."

The editorial asked how one could believe that because "imperialist leaders" talk of peace they are in favor of peace, or that their talk can mean they have changed and have abandoned their war policies. It is wishful thinking, the editorial said, to see "Eisenhower's sort" as a group with profound understanding of the need for peaceful coexistence and to hope for diplomatic negotiations with them; moreover, "to think imperialism for its own protection will give up aggressive war in a nuclear age is subjectivist logic." The editorial reasserted that the people, through struggle, must

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

finally destroy imperialism, and any attempt to avoid the struggle by using the above arguments can only undermine the morale of the masses. "Marxist-Leninists must draw a strict line against the Yugoslav revisionists who deliberately attempt to annul the struggle in the service of imperialism, and must wage an unrelenting struggle against them," it concluded.

In reporting on Khrushchev's 21 June speech to the Rumanian Party Congress, in which he set down the Soviet line on detente for the rest of the Communist world, Jen-min Jih-pao of 24 June stressed the "struggle" aspects of the speech, such as the statements that the imperialists were forced to agree to the summit meeting under the pressure of the people, and that there must be no relaxation of efforts in the struggle for peace. However, the paper also reported the substance of the passage (though in carefully paraphrased form) which indirectly criticized the Chinese. It said: "Though Lenin's theses on imperialism still apply, some of them refer to a period before there were any socialist states and one should not mechanically repeat his statement that imperialist wars are inevitable; under present circumstances they are not inevitable, and whoever does not understand this does not believe in working class strength, underestimates the power of the socialist camp, and has no faith in the great attractive force of socialism."

Peng Chen, politburo representative to the congress, the following day reiterated the Chinese party's position before the assembled bloc party delegates, including its stand on "modern revisionism." As reported in Jen-min Jih-pao, 23 June, he said: "The Rumanian people have made significant contributions to the struggle against imperialist policies of war and aggression and for the defense of world peace. The Rumanian Workers Party, loyal to Marxism-Leninism, has conducted determined struggles against modern revisionism, in order to safeguard the unity of the international Communist movement and defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism. The Chinese people and the Chinese Communist Party are greatly gratified and inspired by all these achievements and contributions of your party and people. Your victories are our victories and our victories are yours."

He remarked that the development of the international situation had completely borne out the contentions of the 1957 Moscow Declaration of Communist and Workers Parties that imperialism was the soil for aggressive wars and there was need for vigilance against the danger of war it posed. Peng held that war can be averted only by strengthening the forces of the people throughout the world, since the masses in various countries are the decisive factor in checking war. He pressed for international struggle against imperialism; saw imperialism as more isolated than ever; and held that its predatory nature would never change. Modern revisionism represented by the Tito clique, he said, was attempting to break up the great unity of the camp and the international Communist movement, thus serving imperialism, and in defense of this unity "a struggle against modern revisionism must be carried out to the end."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

The first official press reaction to the communique of the Rumanian congress and the Satellites' support for the Soviet position was the article by Soong Ch'ing-ling, Vice-Chairman of the Chinese People's Republic, in Jen-min Jih-pao, 27 June. The article did not mention revisionists; it attacked only imperialism. Basically it was defensive, though not in the terms which had become customary in the press. It omitted ideological rationale which characterized previous statements, and contained little of the usual reiteration of China's policy position. The argument leaned heavily on concrete examples of "abuses" against China.

Soong said: "The Chinese people, reflecting the current world situation, have risen up in a new storm of struggle against US imperialism. Is it not a fact of life that only by striking great blows at imperialism can peace be defended -- has not this been the actual case for years? If you wish to eliminate international tension, uphold justice, and safeguard the peace of the world, join the people's struggle to liquidate imperialism. If coexistence is to be peaceful, this can only be if the people maintain high vigilance against the devices of the imperialists, and a high level of militancy and struggle."

She added: "The trained seals of the imperialist press and radio have attempted to show that China is not willing to peacefully coexist, and that it has abandoned this, our basic policy. This is plainly a lie. China is willing to coexist peacefully with anyone, even with imperialism. The fact is that we must coexist with it, since imperialism is an objective reality and the socialist countries are also objective realities, existing side by side in the world. But our desire to peacefully coexist with it does not mean we will submit to imperialism. We will not permit US imperialism to take away our own territory; we have not made countless sacrifices to win our national independence and the benefits of our socialist revolution only to give these away under the delusion of keeping peace with the insatiable imperialists.... Whether there is peaceful coexistence or not does not depend on us alone, since the imperialists decide their own policies."

The editorial on the communique of Rumanian Party Congress in Jen-min Jih-pao, 29 June, contained the last reference to revisionism in the sources surveyed. The editorial was based on the 1957 Moscow Declaration, rather than on the communique. It began: "We hold that in the present situation, the reaffirmation of the correctness of the Moscow Declaration of 1957 by the Communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries is both necessary and of major significance. The Moscow Declaration was formulated on the basis of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the new character of our epoch."

The editorial quoted briefly from the communique only three times, and two of the passages quoted were communique references to the Moscow Declaration. These communique passages affirmed the correctness of the declaration in the light of international events and socialist camp development. The

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

editorial undertook to show in detail how the declaration had been borne out in the successes of socialism, in anti-imperialist struggle, in increasing internal contradictions within imperialism, and in isolation of imperialism. Following each direct quotation from the declaration, it presented its own development of the theme therein, and in this way covered the whole range of contentions which constituted its position in the dispute: the nature of imperialism, the question of war, the winning of peace through struggle, the impossibility of negotiations without struggle, the laws of revolution, the nonpeaceful transition to socialism in capitalist countries and in national liberation movements, the problem of unity among the socialist countries and with the parties and people throughout the world, and revisionism as the main danger. On this last point the editorial observed that "the imperialists and their lackeys in various countries" are only a handful of people, while "the revolutionary people" make up over 90 percent of the world's population and it is inevitable that "the results of struggle will fall into their hands." It quoted the declaration's statement that the internal source of revisionism is bourgeois influence, while its external source is surrender to imperialist pressure.

"The points made about modern revisionism in the Moscow Declaration," it said, "increasingly demonstrate its correctness and significance in the development of the international Communist movement over the past 2 years. All Marxist-Leninists must persist in the struggle against it. Dogmatism too, of course, must be opposed, for it is removed from the masses and reality...but in no event can we write off the fundamental theoretical principles of Marxism-Leninism on the pretext of opposing dogmatism, or replace Marxism-Leninism with revisionism."

In its issue of 1 July, the party's official voice, Hung-ch'i, contained no articles referring to this dispute. The Peiping daily Jeh-min Jih-pao at this point sharply moderated its treatment of the and items on the subject which were published by the latter contained no references to revisionism.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C. Chinese Charge of Revisionist Errors

1. Concept of the New Epoch

An article published in Hung-ch'i, 16 April 1960, recalled Tito's December 1959 Zagreb speech, in which he spoke of the "new epoch." In this epoch, he said, nations can relax and peacefully devote themselves to internal construction; the new problems are not of war and peace, but of cooperation; and the question of economic competition thus arises.

"Thus, this renegade completely writes off the problem of class contradictions and class struggle in the world," Hung-ch'i said, "trying to deny Marxist-Leninists' consistent analysis of our epoch as the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, and of victory of socialism and Communism. In the Tito new epoch, there really is no imperialism, no proletarian revolution, and of course, no theory and policy for proletarian revolution and dictatorship. The fundamental focal points of class contradictions and class struggles in our epoch are not to be found; the fundamental questions of Leninism are absent; and there is no Leninism."

Hung-ch'i agreed that a new epoch had begun, but saw it from a different perspective. One of its characteristics, the periodical held, is the appearance of "the modern revisionists, with the Yugoslav Tito clique as their representative."

One reason why in the new epoch the modern revisionists think the old ideas of Marx and Lenin no longer apply, Hung-ch'i complained, is the progress of science and technology. It quoted Tito as saying the Yugoslavs are not dogmatists because Marx and Lenin did not predict such things as rockets, atom bombs, and technical progress. Actually, it said, what these developments foreshadow is a new social revolution, as Marx and Lenin maintained, rather than the fading of such revolution. In a class society in the epoch of imperialism, Marxist-Leninists can view the development and use of technology only from the standpoint of class analysis. "None of the new techniques, atomic energy, rockets, etc., has changed the fundamental character of the epoch of imperialism or of the proletarian revolution as defined by Lenin, as the modern revisionists claim. The capitalist-imperialist system absolutely will not break up on its own. It will only be overthrown by proletarian revolution, or by national revolution, from within," the periodical held.

The revisionists find support for their concept of the new epoch, Hung-ch'i of 16 June noted, from steps the imperialists take toward relaxation of tension, but it scoffed: "To think, because the imperialists make some fleeting gestures toward relaxation, that the cold war has ended and a 'new era' has dawned is at the least naive thinking without factual basis, if it is not a purposeful effort to whitewash imperialism."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

2. Obsolescent of Leninism

The present world situation, said Hung-ch'i, 16 April, has undergone tremendous changes, but these have not proved the obsolescence of Lenin; they have "more clearly confirmed the truths revealed by him" in the struggle to defend and develop Marxism. "Can it be that Lenin's original conclusions and our usual conception of Leninism have lost their validity and correctness, and that we should not accept the revisionist and opportunist conclusions which Lenin's refutations have long since smashed to pieces and which actual life has discredited? This question now faces us and must be answered. Marxist-Leninists must thoroughly expose the imperialists' and revisionists' absurd position on this and eradicate its influence among the masses," it said.

The article noted that "certain representatives of US imperialism," especially in recent decades, hold that Marxism has ceased to be correct, since capitalism no longer exists, at least in the US. Such nonsense from imperialist preachers, said the article, creates the impression that they and the modern revisionists are talking the same language, except that the revisionists go further and distort the teachings of Lenin. "The imperialists vilify Leninism to weaken its influence and lull the masses' revolutionary will," it said, and they "buy out the waverers and renegades in the workers movement, using them to distort and emasculate its teachings." The Hung-ch'i article lumped together "the US imperialists, overt representatives of the bourgeoisie in many countries, modern revisionists represented by the Tito clique, and right social democrats" as painting a distorted picture of the present world situation in order to support their position that Marxism and Leninism are both outmoded, and called on "the working people of the world" to defend Leninism and "pupils of Lenin" to smash all efforts to distort it.

Lu Ting-yi pointed out in his Lenin Day speech, published in Jen-min Jih-pao, 23 April, that the revisionists' main arguments in "revising, emasculating, and betraying" revolutionary Marxism-Leninism are that, under the new conditions, Lenin's analysis of imperialism has become outmoded; imperialism has changed its nature and renounced its policies of war and aggression. Thus, he charged, using a "so-called historical, nondogmatic" approach to the theoretical legacy of Lenin, they have attacked the revolutionary content and spirit of Marxism-Leninism.

3. Theory of Imperialist War

Citing the Peace Manifesto of the 64 communist parties signed at Moscow in November 1957 as authority, the Jen-min Jih-pao editorial on 22 April said: "This shows that the Leninist principle that imperialism is the source of modern war definitely is not 'outmoded' and never will be. As long as imperialism exists, alertness against the danger of war cannot be relaxed."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

The 16 April issue of Hung-ch'i charged that modern revisionists, on the basis of their assessment of the world situation and their sureness that the theory of class analysis and class struggle is obsolete, reject fundamental Marxist-Leninist theories on such questions as violence, war, and peaceful coexistence. "Some are not revisionists," it said, "but people with good intentions who sincerely want to be Marxists; they are confused by certain new historical phenomena and have some incorrect ideas. Some say, for instance, that the failure of the US imperialists' policy of atomic blackmail means the end of violence. While we thoroughly refute the nonsense of the modern revisionists, we should also help these sincere people to correct such wrong ideas." The periodical quoted Lenin as saying that distinctions must be made between counterrevolutionary violence and revolutionary violence, and that as long as the former exists there is bound to be revolutionary violence to oppose it. "However, denying the inherent class nature of violence, the Yugoslav revisionists remove the distinction between revolutionary and counterrevolutionary violence and between just and unjust war," it noted. "These revisionists also deny that imperialist war is a continuation of imperialist policy; they deny the danger of another imperialist war, and even call Eisenhower 'the man who laid the cornerstone for eliminating the cold war and establishing lasting peace and peaceful competition between political systems.' Moreover, they reject the idea that during peaceful coexistence there still exist complicated, sharp political and economic struggles."

It concluded: "Facts are not as the Yugoslav revisionists would have them -- that Lenin's definition of war as the continuation of politics is obsolete.... We believe in the absolute correctness of Lenin's thinking that war is the inevitable product of exploiting systems. Until the imperialist system and the exploiting classes are eliminated, there will always be wars of one or another kind."

The 9 June issue of Jen-min Jih-pao reported that Liu Chang-sheng, a deputy chairman of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions, addressed the delegates at the WFTU meeting in Peiping on the revisionist view of war and imperialism. "To think that war can be eliminated forever while imperialism still exists is entirely wrong," Liu said. "To disseminate such illusions about imperialism among the peoples in various countries will lead to bad consequences which we can actually already see today."

Liu Chang-sheng was more specific about what kinds of war the Chinese had in mind than spokesmen had been since the question was brought up in the Yu Chao-li article on war in the 1 April Hung-c'hi. Liu observed that in Chinese opinion the question of whether war can be averted refers mainly to world war, and that there does exist "the possibility of blocking the imperialists from launching a new world war," because of socialist-camp growth, the national liberation movements, and revolutionary and peace movements the world over, all in united struggle. But, he said, imperialism remains, so there is still "the danger of its launching a world war." He

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

added, "If we talk only about the possibility of stopping the imperialists from launching a world war, but not about the danger of their launching one, and are not on the alert..., we only lull ourselves and the people." He said that this helps "imperialist arms expansion," and then if war starts, the people are off guard and are alarmed and confused.

Wars which he called "still unavoidable" were: "those resulting from suppression of colonies, national liberation wars against imperialism, wars of suppression against the people in capitalist countries, and revolutionary wars in those countries." While imperialism exists, "to believe wars of this kind can be entirely avoided is completely wrong and contrary to facts, and will take from the oppressed peoples their fighting spirit and prevent them from arming to actively fight an enemy...and from liberating themselves." Another kind of war which he said "the imperialists will continue for a long time" is a cold war, which "they will impose on the world's people while maintaining their great military forces and their entire state machinery."

Thus, struggle by the world's people, long and drawn out, is necessary to preserve world peace, he concluded. To win peace, "struggle and diplomatic negotiations by the socialist countries" must be combined. "It should not be imagined that because diplomatic negotiation is needed, the people's struggle can be dispensed with," he said. "Diplomatic negotiations should be backed by the unity and struggle of the people of the world, and to win peace, we must rely principally on such struggle." One form of struggle, as he saw it, was "the Soviet disarmament proposal put forward after the summit collapse." China supported this, he said, but it was "inconceivable that imperialism would accept complete disarmament." The purpose of putting forward such a proposal "is to arouse the people of the world to unite and oppose imperialist plans for armament drives and war preparations," to reveal "imperialism's warlike nature to the people," and thus "isolate the imperialist bloc so that they will not dare unleash a war." He added: "But there are some who believe such a proposal can be realized...and that the danger of war can be eliminated by relying on it. This is an unrealistic illusion."

According to Jen-min Jih-pao 4 June, Liu Shao-chi pointed out to an Albanian party delegation that "imperialism's aggressive acts relative to the summit conference and throughout the world" had provided "a very profound lesson and negative example to the people of the world," and had "stimulated their struggle against imperialism." He said: "People are now coming to realize increasingly that though US imperialism uses the dual tactic of simultaneous war preparations and peace deception, its inherent nature and ambition does not change." Referring to Khrushchev's "16 May statement at Paris and the just struggle of the Soviet people against imperialist aggression," he said: "The Chinese consider this struggle of great importance in exposing imperialism's true nature and inspiring the people of the world in their struggle to defend peace."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Jen-min Jih-pao reported on 8 June that Liu Ning-yi, chairman of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions, addressing the meeting of the World Federation of Trade Unions, said: "US imperialism has only to pretend amiability and gesture toward peace, and some people think it will suddenly become kindly and give us peace on a platter. The Tito clique, employed by imperialism, exerts great effort to cover its employer by spreading the fantastic story that it has changed its nature, thus helping US imperialism to deceive the world's people. Some people have become confused, as a result, while others have been deceived and still more have illusions about US imperialism. This is something which must not be ignored by the world trade union movement.... Our task is to do our best to explain the truth to the mass of workers and people...and to expose modern revisionism as represented by the Tito clique for the tool of imperialism that it is, so no one will hold any illusions about imperialism...."

An article in Hung-ch'i, 16 June, also criticized those who, though lacking facts to demonstrate that "imperialism has dropped its policies of war," reach this conclusion by following deduction: "Military science is highly advanced, and imperialism will destroy itself if it starts a war; thus it is possible that for its own good it will give up aggressive war and war preparation." This the article called subjectivist logic.

According to Jen-min Jih-pao of 4 June, General Hsiao Hua, a deputy director of the general political department of the People's Liberation Army, asserted that the belief that the danger of war has disappeared because of the appearance of nuclear weapons and the new supremacy of the forces of socialism over those of capitalism "is in opposition to facts and to Marxism-Leninism." Nothing could be more erroneous, he said, "than to think imperialism's aggressive nature has changed and that the possibility of its launching large-scale war against the socialist camp has disappeared."

4. Confidence in Socialist Victory

"There is no doubt whatever," said Jen-min Jih-pao, 22 April, "that Marxism-Leninism will definitely achieve greater victories in the Soviet Union, China, and the other socialist countries, and in all other countries as well. History does not develop evenly, of course, but its twists, turns, and halts are only partial and temporary events over the long run of human development."

"The speed of the victory of Leninism in these 50 years, and especially since World War II, has made the imperialists, revisionists, and reactionaries feel nervous," it said. "They are naturally hostile to the sweeping development and solidity of the socialist and national independence movements under its banner, but the more they curse it the plainer it becomes that Leninism will triumph. Lenin exulted whenever attacked by enemies of the revolution, since this proved that he was right."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

One reason for keeping good faith in ultimate socialist victory, Lu Ting-yi said in his Lenin Day speech reported in Jen-min Jih-pao, 23 April, is the fact that "Russia, India, and China, comprising the majority of the world population, have been drawn into the struggle for emancipation with great rapidity, which as Lenin predicted would determine the final outcome of the struggle. Thus, in this respect, there can be no slightest doubt as to the final outcome."

5. Further Development of Socialism

Lu Ting-yi noted in this Lenin Day speech that "there is a kind of theory" which holds that contradictions exist not among the people, but only "between the enemy and ourselves"; that there is only conformity between the production relations and productive forces and between the political superstructure and economic base in the socialist society. This theory sees the need only to rely on technique, he explained, rather than on the masses, and concludes that there is no need to further develop toward Communism, but only to consolidate the socialist system; and if it is to be further developed, according to the theory, there is no need "to employ struggle and undergo a qualitative leap." Thus it brings "uninterrupted revolution in society" up to the present and no further, he noted.

"This," he said, "is a metaphysical, not a dialectical materialist, viewpoint. Comrade Mao Tse-tung applies dialectical materialism to the period of socialist construction in China, raising the question of a distinction between our contradictions with the enemy and those among the people, a Marxist-Leninism theory which is fundamentally different from the afore-said metaphysical view and on the basis of which the so successful general line was formulated." This general line, he notes, "has not only been attacked by the imperialists and modern revisionists, but has also been maligned by some philistines as 'petit bourgeois fanaticism.'"

On 9 May, Jen-min Jih-pao published the speech of Vice-Premier Ho Lung honoring Czech delegates to China. Ho observed that the progress of socialist revolution and construction in Czechoslovakia had drastically changed its economic life and had also "deeply influenced the ideological outlook of people in Czechoslovakia." That country's 11th party congress in 1958 had emphasized the importance of ideological and cultural revolution, he said, and had pointed out that "it is impossible to build socialism without completing socialist revolution, ideologically and culturally." He added that the Czech party had taken many steps to implement this point.

Lu Ting-yi, in his Lenin Day speech, reported in Jen-min Jih pao, 23 April, voiced Chinese apprehensions about international developments: "The imperialists try to make the socialist countries degenerate into capitalist countries, and modern revisionists like Tito have adapted themselves to this imperialist need."

6. Peaceful Transition to Socialism

"Let us look at all this nonsense about 'peaceful growth of capitalism into socialism' promoted by the old-time revisionists and their modern counterparts, using the bloody facts of the past and of the modern capitalist world," suggested Hung-ch'i, 16 April. Looking at history, it concluded that peaceful revolution should never be thought of as the only possibility and preparation should always be made for the other kind.

It asked: "When the imperialists are armed to the teeth as never before to protect their savage system, can it be, as the modern revisionists say, that they have become peaceable toward the proletariat and the people at home and in the oppressed nations...so that what Lenin referred to as only a rare opportunity can now be found anywhere by the proletariat in capitalist countries?" Marxist-Leninists must never forget, it said, "that the armed forces of the ruling classes are used, above all, to oppress their own people, and that if the proletariat of any country fails to realize this it will not be able to liberate itself." It added: "Marxist-Leninists have always tried to follow the peaceful way to the transition to socialism and they will follow it as long as it is possible, but the proletariat actually is compelled to resort to armed revolution as Lenin said."

"Are Lenin's words only historically applicable, but not so under present conditions, as the modern revisionists hold?" it asked. "They seek to lull the people's revolutionary spirit by empty talk about peaceful transition, but Marxist-Leninists hold that the question of this possibility can be raised only in terms of the actual conditions in a country at a particular time."

Hung-ch'i then asked: "What does a drop in the revolutionary level mean? It means that the opportunists strive to lead the masses to concern themselves merely with their routine, temporary, and local interests, and to give no thought to their long-term, fundamental, over-all interests. Marxist-Leninists hold that the question of parliamentary struggle should be considered in terms of the latter."

It developed this point by quoting Lenin's definition of the purpose of parliamentary struggle, namely, "to combat bourgeois influence in the workers movement and educate its backward elements." It continued: "In short, its purpose is to raise the masses' political-ideological level and to coordinate parliamentary with revolutionary struggle not to lower these standards and separate parliamentary from revolutionary struggle.... We take part in parliamentary struggle, but we must not entertain any illusion as to the bourgeois parliamentary system.... It is difficult to see any possibility for the proletariat to adopt measures in parliament for a peaceful transition to socialism merely by winning a number of votes."

To lower revolutionary standards, the periodical said, means lowering Marxist-Leninist theoretical standards, lowering political struggles to the level of economic ones, and reducing revolutionary struggle to the scope of parliamentary struggle, "thus bargaining away principles for temporary benefits." It quoted Lenin on the importance of a revolutionary theory at a time when "the fashionable preaching of opportunism accompanies absorption with the narrowest forms of practical activity. It claimed that the Chinese party was able to consolidate its position because it adopted a policy of "both unity and struggle in the party's united front with the Kuomintang, not making the slightest concession of principle."

7. Cooperation Instead of Revolution

Throughout these editorials and speeches, the Chinese demonstrated apprehension that the fear of war felt by the "revisionists" and consequent chances for a detente meant a halt to revolution in the world.

"Whether or not one dares to expose the imperialists, especially those in the US, whether one dares to struggle against them, is the test of whether or not one wants to carry out the people's revolution, win the complete liberation of oppressed nationalities, and win a genuine world peace," Lu Ting-yi pronounced in his Lenin Day speech, according to Jen-min Jih-pao, 23 April.

An article in Hung-ch'i, 16 April, said: "Modern revisionists try to confuse the peaceful socialist foreign policy of the proletariat with domestic policies of the proletariat in the capitalist countries; they conclude that peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems also means that capitalism can grow into socialism peacefully, with the proletariat in these countries dropping class struggle and peacefully cooperating with the bourgeoisie, forgetting that they live in a class society. Such views are directly opposed to Marxism-Leninism, and are advanced to protect imperialism and keep the proletariat forever in capitalist enslavement. Peaceful coexistence and popular revolutions are two different things, one relating to nations and the other relating to classes. Being Marxist-Leninists, we have always seen the question of revolution as a nation's own affair, and maintained that the working class can depend only on itself for its emancipation.... Revolution can be neither exported nor imported. No one can prevent the people of a foreign nation from launching a revolution, or create a revolution in that nation...."

The question of the role of struggle in the backward areas of the world was given great importance in the whole dispute. Jen-min Jih-pao, 21 June, held that the Tito "modern revisionists" had come forward to "help imperialism in the matter of struggle by the oppressed peoples, advising the people in the colonies to pursue active coexistence and friendly cooperation with the imperialists, on the grounds that this was the only way and was in fact a prerequisite for socialism." Thus they had pressed these

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

countries to accept "imperialist" economic aid, the paper said. "Tito the renegade" had been going around Asia and Africa "promoting 'peace' and dealing with ulterior motives." This, it said, is "helping the imperialists to sell colonialism and to tighten their control of countries receiving such aid."

"Beginning with their distortion of peaceful coexistence, the revisionists see support for colonial struggles and revolutionary struggles in capitalist countries by the socialist camp as a hazard to peace and peaceful coexistence," it said. "The struggle for world peace should be closely integrated with the national revolutions and the proletarian revolutions in capitalist countries, the two revolutionary struggles being indispensable to the fight for world peace."

At the World Federation of Trade Unions meeting, reported in Jen-min Jih-pao, 8 June, Liu Ning-yi criticized "the revisionist clique's plots to strangle the national democratic movement and to deny the validity of the struggle between the oppressors and the oppressed." He said: "This is a lie by which to deceive the people. The Chinese realize keenly that imperialism and its lackeys are the enemy of the working class and the people of all countries, and that the imperialists are concocting pretexts to disguise their suppression of the national and democratic movements and other people's struggles."

"The imperialists accused the socialist countries, because they support struggle by the people, of not wanting really peaceful coexistence.... The Tito clique has emerged to help them on this, by opposing the struggle for world peace, the national democratic movement against imperialism, and struggles of other peoples, and by twisting peaceful coexistence between socialist and capitalist systems to mean that 'genuine cooperation' should be pursued by the oppressed and the oppressor. But the struggle of the oppressed is a life-and-death one which one of the opponents must win, and peace and peaceful coexistence among countries can be assisted only by resolute struggle against imperialist oppression.... The international working class movement should see that it helps, no hinders the struggle, and the people should increase their vigilance and have no illusions about imperialism spread among them."

"At a time when US imperialism has been making intensified efforts to deceive the people of various countries," charged Hung-ch'i on 16 May, "the modern revisionists have served shamefully as its accomplices." They have done this, the periodical said, "by promoting the theme of peaceful cooperation between oppressors and oppressed and between imperialism and the colonies, and by describing imperialism as having changed and having renounced violence and policies of aggression and expansion." It asked how the revisionists could believe the "nature of imperialism" has changed, or that reactionaries could cease to be what they are, at the very time

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

when South Korea and Turkey "are saturated with US military bases and occupation forces." It concluded: "The refutation of the concept of peaceful cooperation lies in the fact these peoples had risen to struggle, and the refutation of the lie that imperialists and their lackeys would renounce violence was the blood of the masses of demonstrators that drenched the streets. The current national democratic movements against imperialism everywhere are cruel facts which demonstrate the bankruptcy of the deceit of modern revisionists."

According to the 12 June issue of Jen-min Jih-pao, Chang Chi-chun, director of the government's Culture and Education Staff Office, complained to a conference of Chinese educators and journalists in early June that "the modern revisionists, represented by the Yugoslav Tito clique, the lackeys serving imperialist interests, have taken from Marxism-Leninism its revolutionary essence and promoted class peace instead of class struggle and proletarian dictatorship." He said: "Class struggle will never die out while the bourgeois class and its remnant influence are not completely eliminated. He who argues this point denies the most elementary teaching of Marxism-Leninism and repudiates such absolutely fundamental laws as the unity and struggle of opposites."

"The modern revisionists destroy the will of the colonial and imperialist countries' peoples so that they will patiently bear colonial and imperialist rule and exploitation and never rise in revolution. Among people in the socialist countries, they try to spread bourgeois ideas to tempt people to forego revolutionary Marxist-Leninist theory, and they plot for 'peaceful evolution' of socialism into capitalism.... The noble historic task of the Communists of our generation is to expose the modern revisionists who serve imperialism, so as to arm the international working people with the Marxist-Leninist theory of class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat.... Imperialism and its lackeys are being bogged down in encirclement by the world's people, as more and more people have come to clearly see the traitor's face of modern revisionists who serve the interests of imperialism."

Hung-ch'i of 16 April showed apprehension over the idea held by "modern revisionists and certain representatives of the bourgeoisie" that socialism can be achieved without "a revolutionary party of the Proletariat and that party's correct policies," an idea which it called "utter nonsense and pure deception." It accused such people of practicing capitalism under the banner of socialism, and stressed the importance of "firm adherence to revolutionary principle and irrevocable struggle against lowering the standards of revolution, especially against revisionism and right opportunism." In this connection the periodical disputed people who, "influenced by modern revisionism, think that ideological contention between Communists and social democrats is no longer needed, since differences in principle no longer exist between them."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

8. Threat to Bloc Unity

Lu Ting-yi ended his Lenin Day speech, carried in Jen-min Jih-pao, 23 April, with a warning about the unity of the socialist camp.

"The imperialists and modern revisionists," he said, "see the great unity of the socialist camp, and of the world Communist parties and proletariat, as the greatest obstacle to their desire to break up the revolutionary movement in the world, and are scheming to sabotage it by provocation, splitting efforts, rumor, and slander. Marxists-Leninists have always protected this unity."

Jen-min Jih-pao of 22 April pointed out that Marxism-Leninism is "true proletarian internationalism, an international phenomenon from its beginning," and that the Chinese must persist in solidarity with other peoples. It noted that the Chinese were happy to see the unity between them and the other socialist-camp countries growing, as were their friendship with peoples in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and their friendly contacts with people in other capitalist countries. "But the imperialists," it said, "trying to undermine this solidarity, are inciting anti-Chinese campaigns in some countries.... The imperialists and their accomplices, the modern revisionists, and a few reactionaries in various countries are now making a very frenzied effort to disrupt the fraternal unity between China and other socialist countries by diverse low methods. Such provocateurs are not only stupid but very vicious. They can never understand that the unity of the socialist countries originated and has grown under the banner of the great, unshakable Marxism-Leninism.... The fact that these imperialists, revisionists, and a handful of reactionaries in such countries are wildly spreading disharmony show not that their position is firm, but that they are approaching their doom."

Teng Hsiao-ping, in his rally speech on the summit collapse, in Jen-min Jih-pao, 21 May, asserted that "the countries of the socialist camp are growing stronger, their unity is growing daily, and any efforts of the imperialists to spread discord are futile." He ended his speech with "long live" slogans for unity and "unbreakable friendship" between the peoples of China and the Soviet Union, unity of the socialist camp "headed by the Soviet Union," unity of the people of the undeveloped countries "against imperialism," and unity of the people of the world. At the same rally, the paper reported, Liu Ning-yi said: "The socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union will continually unite closely, because unity is the main strength for defending peace. The socialist camp supports and unites the people engaged in national and democratic struggles, and the peace-loving people throughout the world, in a powerful united front against imperialism, to prevent the imperialists from launching war."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

According to Jen-min Jih-pao of 9 May, Ho Lung, addressing the Czechoslovak party's delegation to China, said that that party, together with fraternal parties of other countries, had supported camp unity and unity within the entire movement through "its determined struggles against Yugoslav modern revisionism." In turn, he said, the Chinese strongly supported the Czechoslovak people in "their struggle for world peace, opposition to West German militarism, and peace in Europe." The friendship of the two peoples was built on a solid foundation, he said; "We are closely united by our common Communist ideology and Marxist-Leninist principles."

In early June, Lui Shao-chi addressed an Albanian party delegation, reported Jen-min Jih-pao, 4 June. He said that China and Albania were closely united, and their unity was based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and could never be split. The two had always cooperated closely, he observed, and given mutual support "in struggles against imperialism and modern revisionism." The Albanian visit to China, he said, would further this cooperation and friendship.

An editorial in Jen-min Jih-pao, 1 June, mentioned bloc unity in the context of a meeting of two Asian parties, when it discussed the visit of Chou En-lai to the Mongolian People's Republic. "The parties and people of our two countries," it said, "have carried on a consistent, determined struggle to strengthen the unity of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, in order to safeguard the purity of Marxism-Leninism and to oppose the most dangerous present enemy in the international Communist movement: modern revisionism. In their joint statement the two countries again vowed full effort in the future to further develop and consolidate the fraternal friendship and close cooperation between the two countries, to consolidate the firm unity of the people of all countries in the socialist camp, and to guard world peace...."

Still greater stress was given to bloc unity in the joint statement resulting from this Chou visit. As reported in Jen-min Jih-pao of 1 June, it said both countries' determination was to continue "utmost efforts to further develop and expand fraternal friendship and comprehensive cooperation between themselves, and to consolidate the monolithic unity of the peoples in the socialist camp headed by the great Soviet Union.... Since the establishment of the People's Republic of China, both countries have been smoothly developing truly fraternal relations and mutual assistance, based on the great principle of proletarian internationalism." China was achieving "big leaps forward" in socialist construction, it said, and thereby making great contributions to the strengthening and prosperity of the entire socialist camp. It added: "Both parties pointed out with satisfaction that the socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union, has become stronger and more united and consolidated than ever." Both were deeply convinced that their joint talks and the agreements

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

concluded would greatly contribute to further consolidation and development of friendship and close cooperation between their peoples, the paper said, and to "the strengthening of the unity of the countries in the socialist camp headed by the great Soviet Union and the safeguarding of peace in Asia and the world." It concluded: "To oppose the schemes of the US reactionary bloc to launch a new war, all peoples must heighten their vigilance, unite all forces, and further strengthen the unity of the socialist camp.

On 23 June, Jen-min Jih-pao reported Peng Chen's speech at the Rumanian Party Congress. "The Chinese party," he said, "has always seen the socialist camp as an integrated whole and felt that imperialist aggression against any one country is directed against China and the entire camp. As long as there is unity in the socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union, and among the international working class, the peoples of the oppressed countries, and the peoples fighting monopoly capital in capitalist countries, war can be stopped and peace protected. The duty of Communists is to strengthen the unity of the camp and the movement on the basis of the Moscow Declaration, uniting at the same time all international forces possible in the broadest possible anti-imperialist united front. The unity of the camp and the international Communist movement is the best guarantee of peace and of the liberation of the working class and the oppressed nations."

In the struggle to defend world peace, Liu Ning-yi said to the Peiping meeting of the World Federation of Trade Unions (reported in Jen-min Jih-pao, 8 June), the broadest united front should be formed, uniting all forces possible. He noted the existing division within the international working class, charging that it had been forced by "imperialism and reaction" in various countries. They had long used right-wing social democrats to disrupt working class unity, he said, and now new tools had been added: "the modern revisionists represented by the Tito clique, who have degenerated into working class renegades." Such tools, new or old, he said, had the common feature of "draining the militant working class spirit and numbing its fighting will, disarming it by obliterating the distinction between us and the enemy." To heal the division and bring unity of the working class required "clear demarcation between us and the tools of the imperialists and a resolute struggle against their splitting activities." Unity could come only through a struggle, never through compromise, he said.

Chou En-lai also discussed the problem at length before these trade union representatives from bloc and nonbloc countries throughout the world, according to Jen-min Jih-pao, 7 June. Socialist camp unity, he said, and the unity of the working class of all countries "is the certain guarantee for the cause of world peace, for emancipation of the working class, and for liberation of the oppressed nations." He continued: "Reliance on it will make possible the uniting of all possible forces in the broadest united front, and the isolation of and final triumph over the imperialists. It is precisely for this reason that imperialism fears and is trying by all means to destroy this unity; for this, its most vicious tactic is to employ the modern revisionists to conduct activities designed to split the working class.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"The modern revisionists do their best to create illusions about peace among the working class ranks and to wipe out the dividing line between the enemy and us, trying to abolish the revolutionary struggle of the working class and to perpetuate reactionary imperialist rule. In this way, the modern revisionists play a role not possible for the imperialists and their other lackeys, so that to completely expose them and rub out the poisonous ideas they spread, smashing their activities aimed at splitting the working class, is a serious, fighting task." He said that the international unity of the working class can be maintained and strengthened only if this is done. He closed with a toast which stressed "the great unity of the people of the whole world."

The follow-up editorial on this meeting, in Jen-min Jih-pao of 10 June, said: "The modern revisionists are using the cloak of Marxism-Leninism in this effort to split the international workers movement, and spreading illusions in order to end the working class's revolutionary struggles and perpetuate imperialist rule. Constant exposure and smashing of the intrigues of the revisionist's attempt to destroy working class unity will be needed, to isolate them and enable the movement to achieve its real goal of liberation of the entire world's working class."

The Jen-min Jih-pao editorial of 9 May, discussing the U-2 incident and asserting the good prospects for the technique of struggle as a means of achieving peace, said: "This is primarily because of the existence of a powerful socialist camp, the indestructible unity of the socialist countries, headed by the Soviet Union, and the unity and solidarity of socialist countries with the oppressed countries, exploited peoples, and all those who love peace. The imperialists and their attendants have done their best to undermine this unity of the socialist countries and the unity between them and the people in Asian, African, and Latin American countries, but their shameless, low devices can never succeed. Standing steadily with the people of all fraternal countries, the Chinese people are continually on guard against the aggressive schemes of the US imperialists and constantly ready to strike back with determination."

The Chinese worried that the efforts at peace and the accompanying change in the "image" of imperialism would harm the revolutionary efforts in the backward countries, the press showed. The struggle for peaceful co-existence, insisted Jen-min Jih-pao, 21 June, should always be integrated with the revolutionary struggle of all countries, including the people in colonial countries who are against imperialism. It said: "The imperialists fear the mutual support of the people of all countries and attempt to wreck the unity manifested in such mutual support. The peace forces headed by the socialist camp should work toward a broad united front to struggle for peace and socialism, based on struggles of people everywhere and on the mutual support given by such struggles. The greatest strength of the

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

struggle against imperialism is seen in the two slogans, 'Workers of all countries, unite,' and 'Workers of oppressed nations, unite.' The cause of Communism, as well as the cause of peace, must rely on these two kinds of unity, through them achieving the great unity of all peace-loving forces and waging the struggle against imperialism."

9. Fear of War

The foregoing positions, and the threat they pose to the international Communist movement, the Chinese press held, are traceable to and explainable by the revisionists' fear of nuclear war.

In his Lenin Day speech, published in Jen-min Jih-pao, 23 April, Lu Ting-yi said that "modern revisionism is a product of imperialist policy," and that it is important to oppose it because the revisionists can play a part among the masses that the bourgeoisie and right social democrats can not. "They are the agents of imperialism and the enemies of the proletariat and working people in all countries," Lu Ting-yi said. This situation results from their panic in the face of the "imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail," he explained. They develop from fear of war to fear of revolution, and go from not wanting revolution themselves to opposing revolution by others; thus they obstruct national liberation movements and the proletarian revolution in other countries, he said.

"The revisionists have joined the imperialists in spreading the terror of war," complained Hung-ch'i, 16 June, "claiming that a third world war would spell doom for the world, including both aggressor and victim. At the same time, they have deluded the people by contending that once distrust is removed, the imperialists will renounce war as a method of gaining its objectives."

"The Tito group, to spread terror of atomic war among the masses, adopts the US imperialist line of using weapons for war threats and blackmail against the world," Hung-ch'i, 16 April, claimed. "This can temporarily deceive those who do not understand the real situation, but cannot intimidate those who have awakened. Even those who now fail to understand will gradually come to understand, with the help of the advanced elements. It is not technology, but man -- the masses -- which determines mankind's fate, as Marxist Leninists maintain and as Comrade Mao Tse-tung has pointed out."

Quoting the Moscow Declaration's statement that imperialism would doom itself if it should unleash a war, because the people would no longer tolerate a system that brought them so much suffering, the 22 April Lenin Day editorial in Jen-min Jih-pao asserted: "It is only by pointing this out that we can ensure that the people in all countries do not mentally disarm themselves, capitulate to the war maniacs' intimidation and blackmail, and fall into panic and confusion in case war should unfortunately

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

break out after all. Peaceful coexistence among nations with differing social systems requires flexibility and patience. The Chinese people, in their struggle against enemies, foreign and domestic, have never refused to compromise where it did not damage the basic interests of the people, and will not refuse to do so.... But the struggle for peace is a protracted one, and imperialism will not quickly accept any agreement favorable to it."

As shown in Jen-min Jih-pao of 9 June, Liu Chang-sheng talked about this war fear to delegates to the WFTU meeting in Peiping, but put it in terms of cold war. "China stands for peaceful coexistence between socialist and capitalist countries," he said, "but despite the socialist camp's striving for this since World War II, the imperialists have persisted in cold war and arms expansion, thus creating tension. We must make it clear to the people that they must not be frightened by the cold war waged by the imperialists, but should determinedly oppose this policy, expose its ugly features, and carry the struggle directly against it, for only by so doing can it be prevented from developing into a hot war."

D. Bloc Unity and Criticism of China

Premier Chou En-lai showed great sensitivity in early April over the related questions of bloc unity and criticism of China from within the Communist movement. In his speech to the National People's Congress, carried in Jen-min Jih-pao, 11 April, the term "revisionist" emerged well before the 16 April date when it was first made a charge against the Soviets; however, in Chou's speech it was raised not so much in the context of the dispute over detente, on which question the speech was singularly amenable to the Soviet position, as in respect to "anti-Chinese activities."

"The imperialists, headed by the United States," Chou said, "stirred up a vicious anti-Chinese wave, in order to prevent the spread of China's influence and to isolate it in international affairs. Though this scheme was joined in by the reactionaries, revisionists, and their parrots in a number of countries, the results of the hue and cry were the opposite of what they intended: they were instead exposed in their own true colors.... Solidarity and friendship with the peoples of other countries is the main current of our relations with those countries, and anti-Chinese activities are only a backwater. It is only a minute number of imperialists, reactionaries, revisionists, and their parrots who are anti-Chinese; the overwhelming majority of mankind...who stand for peace and feel a sense of justice, are not anti-Chinese but fervently demand friendship with us."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Chou declared it the duty of the Chinese people to consolidate the unity of the camp in accord with Marxist-Leninist principles and based on proletarian internationalism, not only in their own highest interests, but also those of the peoples of the socialist countries and progressive mankind.

Seeming to anticipate the charge of "dogmatism" which came from the Soviet party presidium, on the same day, Lu Ting-yi in a speech on 22 April, published in Jen-min Jih-pao on 23 April, said: "According to the modern revisionists, there would seem to be no longer any difference between socialism and imperialism, and whoever persists in struggling against imperialism and in revolution will be hindering peace and peaceful coexistence, and can be labelled a 'rigid dogmatist.' But we Marxist-Leninists know well what dogmatism is and have continually fought it. Our Chinese Communist Party has rich experience in fighting dogmatism.... For the modern revisionists, opposition to dogmatists is merely a pretext by which they oppose revolution and do away with it, and by which they misinterpret and adulterate Marxism-Leninism."

Recalling Tito's assertion that "We are not dogmatists," the Chinese responded in Hung-ch'i of 16 April: "Not dogmatists, fine--who wants to be dogmatists? But there is Marxist-Leninist opposition to dogmatism, and there is that ostensible opposition to it which is actually opposition to Marxism-Leninism."

Chinese reaction to this charge also came in Lu Ting-yi's 1 June speech to a cultural and educational conference published 2 June in Jen-min Jih-pao. La said: "The Yugoslav revisionist bloc, headed by Tito, whitewashed the imperialists, especially those in the US and their chief Eisenhower, and claimed that by doing so it was 'creatively developing Marxism-Leninism,' and that not to do so would amount to 'rigid dogmatism.' This is total nonsense and a complete disparagement of Marxism-Leninism. The 'theory' of the Tito revisionist bloc is quite similar to the view of our own comprador bourgeois class--the theory of imperialist jackals."

Soong Ching-ling's article published 27 June in Jen-min Jih-pao at the end of the campaign also revealed Chinese sensitivity to socialist camp criticism. Attributing what she referred to as indignation and anger over China's determination to liberate Taiwan to the imperialists, she said: "Friends, do not look at China as the source of the tension in the Far East--we threaten no one; look instead to imperialism which commits open aggression against China and prepares even greater aggression." Noting that the US had blamed China for the failure of Eisenhower's trip to Japan, she said: "This would be laughable if it were not accompanied by an abusive attack on the Chinese People's Republic. Our peaceful foreign policy has been maligned, and stepped-up efforts of the US propaganda machine now aim to isolate China from her neighbors and split her away from her great ally,

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

the Soviet Union. Gentlemen, it will never succeed.... We stand shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union and other members of the socialist camp. Our friendship is eternal, and this has been our policy from the beginning of our people's republic. It is our policy today. It will always be our policy."

Avoiding open reference to the Soviet critics of Chinese domestic innovations, Jen-min Jih-pao of 22 April touched on critics domestic and foreign: "The Western bourgeoisie condemn us to failure, and there are even a few of their mimics in our ranks who term our general line, big leaps, and peoples communes products of 'petit bourgeois fanaticism,' failing to see that these are exactly products of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism. Let them wait, for 10 years perhaps, and then they will see. The foreign and Chinese Philistines, their heads full of metaphysics, as Lenin said, know no other rule than the sacrosanct 'normalcy' of bourgeois relations, and completely fail to understand the revolutionary dialectic which is decisive in Marxism.

An additional factor in Chinese resentment over world Communist parties' reactions to their international and domestic policies, to judge by the press, was the effect the whole revisionist viewpoint might have domestically, on the minds of their people. In an editorial on a conference of education, culture, and journalism workers then convening, Jen-min Jih-pao on 1 June discussed the long-term nature of the ideological class struggle in China, the fundamental core of their "cultural revolution" then under way, and the continuing conflict with the bourgeois right opportunists, and it quoted Mao to the effect that the influence of the bourgeoisie and intellectuals from the old society would remain in China as a class ideology for a long time.

The editorial said: "Meanwhile, the US imperialists and the modern revisionists serving their interests are increasing their conspiratorial devices for corrupting the people in the socialist countries with their bourgeois ideas. Such a conspiracy is of course doomed to failure, but we must raise our vigilance and give serious attention to continuing the struggle against bourgeois ideas in our country, and against modern revisionist ideas in all ideological areas. Experience proves that study and mastery of Marxism-Leninism and the study of Mao Tse-tung's thinking... is the important guarantee of continual victory in this struggle.

These possible internal effects were gone into more deeply, at the conference, by Lin Feng, party Central Committee member active in educational and cultural work. In a long speech, as in Jen-min Jih-pao, 2 June, in which he discussed at length the problem of bourgeois ideology and the struggle mentioned above, he observed that the broad masses in China were determined in the struggle against US imperialism, and that intellectuals who had formerly held illusions and fear in regard to imperialism had largely awakened to facts, and "it is now very difficult for

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

imperialism's reactionary propaganda to find a market in our country." Marxism-Leninism had consolidated its position, he said, and the movement to study it via Mao Tse-tung's works had been joined by cadres, intellectuals, and the masses, and become the ideological weapon for broad sections of these "in assessing the world situation, studying problems, and as a guide to work."

Lin ten noted: "The imperialists have not only carried out direct military aggression against our country, but through culture, education, religion, and other means have conducted cultural aggression in an attempt to bring influence helpful to their aggressive and colonial policies among the intellectuals. Therefore, the thorough elimination of US imperialism and its influence in policies and ideology in our country is of high importance to our revolution." Lin quoted Mao to the effect that inevitably the viewpoints of the bourgeoisie will be reflected. Therefore, he said, the Chinese must carry out political and ideological revolution and struggle to uphold the proletariat and to eliminate the bourgeoisie in ideological fields. He went on to say:

"This struggle must be conducted not only against domestic bourgeois ideology, but also imperialist ideology and the modern revisionist ideology which serves it.... Modern revisionism is a true agent of imperialism and the deadly enemy of the working people of all countries. Modern revisionists may create reactionary influences among the proletariat and working people which the bourgeoisie and rightist elements of socialist and democratic parties can never bring about.... Thus an important task on the cultural and educational fronts in China today is to apply Marxist-Leninist ideas to criticize and correctly evaluate the cultural heritage of the bourgeoisie. The modern revisionist attitude toward this cultural heritage, especially that of the 18th and 19th centuries, is to throw away the good and the beneficial and keep the reactionary and useless, in order to sell revisionist theory and spread bourgeois ideas.... Contrary to the modern revisionist attitude, ours is to keep the liquid and throw away the dregs.... The policy of 'let all flowers bloom' should be followed in criticizing bourgeois cultural heritage, with full expression of differing academic views...we must make a severe distinction between criticism of modern revisionism and debate on the academic problem of cultural heritage in a critical manner."

To the same domestic audience of educators and journalists, Chang Chi-chun, in a speech published in Jen-min Jih-pao, 12 June, stated the need to expose before the people of the world the reactionary essence of imperialism and its peace deceptions, and "to conduct a determined struggle against the so-called Western Civilization and American way of life which the imperialists exert their best efforts to disseminate in an effort to numb and poison people the world over."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

II. INDONESIA

Party Reaction to Moscow-Peiping Dispute

The PKI (Indonesian Communist Party) reaction to the ideological dispute between Moscow and Peiping, which was brought into the open with particular vehemence in the April, May, and June 1960 press of those countries, has taken two forms in the Indonesian party press. The first has been to make available the texts of, or at least excerpts from, soem recent (June 1960) Chinese expressions of Marxist-Leninist doctrine. Second, the PKI, in its own discussions of current problems, has taken a stand on some of the concepts at issue. In these domestic statements, the party has not, however, been altogether consistent in following either the Soviet or the Chinese line exclusively. These statements indicate that it is possible that as of late June 1960, the Indonesian Communists were split into pro-Moscow and pro-Peiping factions and that one was not sufficiently dominant over the other to unite the entire party behind a single official line. On the other hand, the PKI in the past has shown itself to be adept at fence-sitting, and its present seeming ambivalence may be no more than a holding operation while the party waits for the international Communist scene to crystallize before it decides which way to jump. The following survey outlines the tentative pattern which can be detected in the PKI response.

Since the latest available issue of the party theoretical journal, Bintang Merah, is that of February 1960 and since Harian Rakjat was forbidden to publish from 23 March to 30 April 1960 by an Indonesian Army ban, the PKI's attitude toward the publication of the first round of Chinese articles in April and the Soviet response on Lenin's birthday is not known. Suara Ibukota, the biweekly organ of the Greater Djakarta Committee of the PKI, was publishing, however, and reprinted a relatively moderate Chou En-lai speech of 10 April 1960 rather than a more forceful statement of the Chinese view in its issue No 9, Vol III, of 1 May 1960. When it resumed publication in May, Harian Rakjat failed to mention that the Soviets and the Chinese were expressing divergent opinions on basic Marxist-Leninist principles.

During all of May, the only articles dealing either with the USSR or China which might remotely bear on those countries' respective ideological positions were a brief NCNA dispatch in the 19 May 1960 Harian Rakjat quoting Kuo-Mo-jo in a statement of support for Soviet efforts to negotiate with the US "imperialists," and coverage on 10 and 25 May 1960 of Mao Tse-tung's meeting with delegates from Africa, Latin America, the Middle East, and Japan. The latter article quoted extensively from Mao's remarks and emphasized his comments on the "essentially aggressive nature of imperialism" and the need for a world-wide united front to defeat "the reactionary forces of the imperialists." The Indonesian interest in Mao's

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

statements may have derived either from their substantive content or simply from the fact that this was one of the rare occasions in recent years when Mao has made a public pronouncement of any sort. However, despite its failure to cover the developing ideological controversy, the Indonesian Communist leadership was apparently informed of its nature and of western speculation concerning its relation to the summit failure, for in a 21 May 1960 feature article on the collapse of the summit conference, the Harian Rakjat foreign editor criticized western suggestions that Khrushchev had "surrendered to the 'Chinese line' in Paris" and reasserted Soviet devotion to a policy of "peace and fierce resistance to US attempts to revive the cold war."

After this initial period of relative silence, the PKI suddenly began, at the end of the first week in June, to inform its members of the Chinese side of the story on a daily basis.

On 7 June, Harian Rakjat carried a report on a 5 June speech by General Hsiao Hua in which imperialism was proclaimed to be the source of war and his listeners were enjoined not to fear such a war as it would become a revolutionary war destroying the imperialist system. The 8 June 1960 Harian Rakjat reported on a 6 June Chinese government statement supporting the newest Soviet disarmament proposals and stating that their rejection by the West would further strip away the "imperialists' mask of peace." A 9 June article covered Liu Ning-yi's speech to the WFTU general council session in Peiping denying that the nature of imperialism had changed and urging a vigorous pursuit of the national liberation struggle in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. On 11 June, Harian Rakjat carried extensive excerpts from Liu Ch'ang-sheng's 8 June speech to the WFTU on the inevitability of war as long as imperialism exists. The 13 June Harian Rakjat contained a report on Liu Shao-ch'i's 3 June speech at a banquet honoring a visiting Albanian delegation, in which he argued against a detente with the West; a long article on the WFTU anticolonialism resolution; and a briefer article on the WFTU resolution on Japan. On 14 June the paper gave a full report on the WFTU general resolution and an account of the mass rally held to mark the conclusion of the session. This article included a brief summary of the remarks of the Soviet delegate, Grishin, on that occasion, although Harian Rakjat had failed to publish his 6 June speech to the WFTU on coexistence. The 15 June Harian Rakjat summarized the reports given by Louis Saillant and Ibrahim Zakaria at the meeting. On 16 June, Harian Rakjat concluded its intensive coverage of the Chinese line as suddenly as it had been begun, with the publication of long quotations from Chang Chi-ch'un's speech to the National Conference of Outstanding Cultural and Education Workers in Peiping, in which he violently criticized modern revisionism.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

All these articles were NCNA dispatches except the 15 June summary of the Saillant and Zakaria reports, which was credited to Tass. Furthermore from the point of view of content, the above list clearly reveals that Harlan Rakjat failed markedly to give "equal time" to expositions of the Soviet side of the ideological quarrel.

This impression that Harlan Rakjat's reporting has been weighted in the direction of the Chinese is reinforced by the fact that in its articles on Khrushchev's speech at the Rumanian Party Congress, the paper failed to include any of his remarks on Marxism-Leninism, although it published long excerpts from the speech on two successive days, 23 and 24 June 1960. Moreover, although its coverage of Chinese ideological statements ceased on 16 June, Harlan Rakjat began on that date to carry a daily series of reports on the development of urban communes in China which have an extremely favorable picture of the entire domestic Chinese scene. This series was written by Suroto, an Antara correspondent, and ran through 28 June 1960.

There is no indication in the press as to when the Indonesian Communists were first alerted to the developing controversy between Moscow and Peiping. Aidit's speech, published as a supplement to the May 1960, Vol VII, No 5, issue of the Review of Indonesia and also appearing in the 20 May 1960 Pravda, commemorates the 90th anniversary of Lenin's birth, an event which has served as the forum for much of the Chinese-Russian controversy. The speech is aimed at proving the universality and general usefulness of Leninism. Aidit particularly praises Lenin for updating Marxism to fit the changed world situation, using much the same argument that Khrushchev used in regard to Leninism in Bucharest. He also gives special praise to Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder, and says, "In my opinion, this book stands out as the one that has helped the most in turning many Communist parties into genuine Marxist-Leninist parties." He notes that this was the first of Lenin's works to be translated into Indonesian, in 1951. He then credits the study of Lenin's works by party leaders who were in hiding after the August 1951 arrests of Communists by the Sukiman government with providing the basis for the ensuing shift in tactics to the national united front policy and support of a nationalist government without Communists participating in it, as well as the policy of developing the party and stressing work among the peasants, which have brought the PKI so much success.

Aidit has consistently justified his continued commitment to this program by arguing that Indonesia is now at the national democratic stage of the revolution and that this must not be confused on either the theoretical or practical level with a socialist revolution. A recent example of his exposition of this doctrine is his speech to the Grand Assembly of the 1945 Generation in March 1960, which was published in the April 1960, Vol VII, No 4, Review of Indonesia. In this speech Aidit applies the national united front tactic to the economic as well as the political problems currently facing Indonesia.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

The economic aspects of this policy are also discussed by Engineer Sakirman, a member of the politburo and the party's expert on economics, in a two-part article in the 9 and 10 June 1960 issues of Harian Rakjat. Sakirman notes that there are two "deviations" among the defenders and supporters of "socialism a la Indonesia." There is the "leftist" attitude which wants "socialism a la Indonesia" implemented now. Sakirman calls its proponents "stage-jumpers." He argues that radical measures would prevent the formation of the united front and split the forces of the revolution. Immediate nationalization of all means of production would overburden the capabilities of the state apparatus. Furthermore, he continues, such measures would misdirect Indonesian energies against national capitalists, rather than against the imperialists and landlords. On the other hand, there is the rightist attitude which views foreign capital investment as a necessary prerequisite to the development of Indonesia, and Sakirman condemns this too. Both these deviations he sees as occurring within the ranks of the people. They are therefore not basic contradictions and are not to be overcome by antagonistic means. However, at times they may become basic contradictions because of the infiltration of enemies into the ranks of the people; by inference, more forceful measures would then be needed to deal with them.

However, even in regard to "imperialists," the PKI line in the past year has placed more stress on vigilance, firmness, unity, and constant pressure than on revolutionary violence. The following rather mild statement made by Aidit in his speech on the fifth anniversary of the Bandung Conference, as published in the 30 April 1960 Harian Rakjat, might be considered typical: "The imperialists in our country are still active and have not slackened their activity in the other Asian and African countries. Imperialism cannot be met with sweet smiles. The imperialists must be pushed on, opposed, and defeated by the united forces of the people through mass popular actions inspired by the spirit and principles of Bandung."

Aidit's 40th anniversary speech on 23 May 1960 indicates that the PKI line may be hardening in respect to the domestic scene and that the possibility that violent revolutionary tactics will have to be employed by the party is at least being contemplated. (See FDD Translation No 741, 13 July 1960.) However, Aidit has as yet made no comments on international affairs which would suggest that he has departed from a position of unconditional support for the Khrushchev line on peaceful coexistence. For example, in his statement on the 1959 anniversary of the October Revolution, published in Kehidupan Partai, November-December 1959, he said: "In a situation in which the world is confronted with a choice between peaceful coexistence and war, with all its destructive consequences, the socialist world has declared its choice, that is, peaceful coexistence. That is also the choice of people everywhere on the face of the earth."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

In contrast to this is the article entitled "The PKI and Current International Problems," by Politburo Member and PKI Secretary Sudisman, in the 30 May 1960 Harian Rakjat. This article was one of a series written by various party leaders to mark the 40th anniversary of the PKI. Most of the series is simply a mechanical repetition of the main points of PKI policy as approved at the recent sixth party congress. The Sudisman article, however, could be considered a formal declaration of position by the "radical" or "pro-Chinese" faction within the party. It is the strongest statement of its kind to be published in the PKI press within the past few years, and it conforms with the ideological line currently being expounded in Peiping in all essential points.

The article becomes controversial immediately with the statement that, "The PKI has struggled for 40 years. The 40th anniversary of the party is being commemorated in an atmosphere in which the fury of the peoples of the entire world has reached a peak against the imperialists, headed by the US, which does not at all wish to abandon its policy of war. What Lenin said about the system of imperialism being the source of war is exactly true. Actually, for the imperialists, peace is no more than an interval between two wars. This interval is used to the greatest possible extent to expand their armaments, to make their ambition to control the world a reality." Sudisman charges that the US attempts to suppress the national liberation and revolutionary movement "through the use of two tactics, force and deception." He also rails at length against the rearming of Japan.

Returning to the basic theme of the article, he says: "After 40 years of struggle, the PKI has a correct understanding of the objective law that imperialism is the source of war, and by making use of this law the PKI opposes, prevents, and destroys imperialist war. The PKI fiercely defends peace and opposes war, but if the imperialists stubbornly persist in igniting another war, we will not be afraid. Peace is sure to be made victorious via struggle and in struggling the Communists will not know surrender."

In the second part of the article Sudisman quotes Aidit's statement in the general report to the sixth PKI congress that the essence of the present epoch is the transition from capitalism to socialism. Sudisman sees this epoch as characterized by four phenomena: the great successes of the Soviet bloc, the peace movement and the anticolonial movement, a heightening of the spirit of proletarian internationalism, and the limitation of the forces of imperialism. In his commentary on the third point, he launches an attack on modern revisionism which parallels that of Peiping:

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"The revisionists defend a theory that the imperialists have changed their nature and abandoned their policy of war on their own volition and therefore that it is no longer necessary to wage an anti-imperialist struggle. Whoever relentlessly opposes imperialism and pursues the revolution 'obstructs peace and peaceful coexistence' and becomes 'a crude dogmatist.' For the revisionists, opposing 'dogmatism' is only a pretext for opposing revolution, seeking a way to negate the revolution, and misinterpreting and falsifying Marxism-Leninism. In fact, modern revisionists have become panicky and afraid because of the imperialists' policy of threatening nuclear war. They go from fear of war to fear of revolution, and rebound from not wanting revolution themselves to opposing other peoples who are in the process of revolution. To meet the needs of the imperialists, they try to obstruct the development of the national liberation movement and the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in various countries."

The similarity to recent Chinese remarks persists in Sudisman's discussion of the last point: "The forces of the imperialists are limited and they will withdraw if opposed, because imperialism has set its course on a downward slope and has no future. In the struggle against imperialism, all the people of the world must strengthen their ranks and support one another. Only by combining the struggle of the people of the socialist states, the struggle for national liberation of the peoples of colonial and semicolonial areas, and the struggle for world peace can the imperialists and their tools be defeated and eternal world peace achieved. 'If the imperialists obstinately cause a third world war to break out,' in the words of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, 'it is certain that several hundreds of millions will again shift to socialism; at that time there will no longer be room in the world for the imperialists and there will be a far greater possibility that the entire structure of imperialism will completely collapse.' (On the Correct Handling of Contradictions in the Ranks of the People, page 54)."

On 7 June 1960, Harian Rakjat published an article in the 40th anniversary series by Tjoo Tik-tjoen, member of the central committee and PKI delegate to the fifth International Conference of Institutes of Marxism-Leninism in Bucharest in late August 1959. This article, entitled "Develop the Active Role of the Masses Fully Under the Guidance of Marxism-Leninism," also contains remarks pertinent to the Moscow-Peiping ideological dispute. The first part of the article asserts the inevitability of eventual Communist victory because of the masses' support for the party, but warns against overconfidence and a lessening of revolutionary fervor and vigilance. He emphasizes that it takes considerable effort to make historical fact.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Tjoo then remarks: "The PKI's experience during the past 40 years, particularly in recent years, has strengthened our belief in a truth of Marxism-Leninism, that is, that there has never been a class in power in the world which has voluntarily surrendered its power.

"We Indonesian Communists, like the Communists in other countries, are always ready to make use, to the best possible effect, of every opportunity and possibility for traversing a peaceful road in struggling for our aspirations. But the imperialists and the domestic reactionaries became nervous and afraid when they saw the PKI emerge as the victor and become the largest party in Indonesia in the three general elections, so that it was they themselves who began to play with force of arms, as in the counterrevolutionary PRRI-Permesta-DI-TII rebellion to halt the [PKI's] advance. In addition, they continue to strive stubbornly by all means and devices, such as by changes in the general elections laws, the dissolution of parties, etc., to halt the development of the PKI.

"Therefore, we Communists, in confronting a situation in which the class struggle is daily becoming sharper, must always heighten our vigilance and be ready to face whatever role may be performed by the imperialists and all the domestic reactionaries. The world of tomorrow is sure to be ours, but not as a gift. On the contrary, we and the working people must create it. The imperialists and all the reactionaries are sure to die, but not because they commit suicide. On the contrary, we and the working people must kill them."

In the 9 June 1960 Harian Rakjat, Ngadiman Hardjosubroto, member of the PKI central auditing commission and former chairman of the PKI central committee, further developed the argument stated by Tjoo. His contribution to the 40th anniversary series was entitled "The PKI and Peace." He begins by asserting the PKI's past and present devotion to peace, but notes that some people are dubious about the Communist struggle for peace since the Communists operate on the basis of the theory of a revolutionary and peaceless class struggle. He denies that this must inevitably be a bloody struggle, but like Tjoo hedges the possibility of a peaceful struggle with conditions:

"If the form of this struggle depended entirely on the party and the Communists, the process of revolutionary struggle would be sure to be a peaceful and calm process. But, unfortunately, the determination of this form does not depend on the party and the Communists exclusively. The enemies of the people, the enemies of the Communists, and other progressive groups are certain to defend their positions to the death by using all weapons at their command. History has shown that there is no group in power which voluntarily steps down from the throne."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Ngadiman concluded his article by asserting that the class struggle and the struggle for peace are inextricably entwined and that to reject the former and say that one would pursue the latter is like "holding out one's hand in greeting but hiding the other hand, which holds a dagger."

A similar message, although in a somewhat milder form, was the theme of the speech made by Achadijat, chief of the international department of Sobsi (All-Indonesia Central Labor Federation), to the WFTU session in Peiping. The relevant passages in his remarks follow:

"We, the people of Indonesia, consider US imperialism as our most dangerour enemy, but our experience indicates that the forces of imperialism are not unlimited. If the people unite closely and launch an unyielding struggle against them, the imperialists can be forced to retreat.... The basic task at present is to concentrate all forces in order to crush the forces of war and aggression headed by US imperialism.... We do not beg peace from the imperialists. The imperialists are not willing to withdraw and we must force them to do so. We are lovers of peace and therefore we must crush imperialism, which is the root of war.... We must fearlessly expose the Tito clique because it has spread divisory poisons in an attempt to cripple the class struggle, of the workers and people from various countries, against imperialism and colonialism and for eternal peace."

The opinions expressed in these four articles indicate that the radical faction within the PKI sees a world in which, internationally, war is inevitable as long as imperialism exists and in which, domestically, violent revolutionary struggle is inevitable as long as classes exist. Neither such war nor such revolution is to be feared; on the contrary, the Communists must always stand ready for the struggle, in which they are sure to be victorious.

III. OUTER MONGOLIA

Press Reprints Antirevisionist Articles From Foreign Sources

Two articles are translated from foreign sources, one from Rumania and the other from the Soviet Union, and published without comment in the Outer Mongolian press.

The first appearing in Namtiin Amidral of April 1960, is a translation of the report made by Gheorghe Vasilichi, who was a member of the Fifth Party Congress held in Bucharest during August and September 1959. The following excerpt is taken from it: "The violent struggle against the growth of economism, Menshevism, revisionism, and opportunism has produced new forms of Marxist revolutionary parties which tend to reduce party

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

unity with regard to Marxism-Leninism. Party unity is a basic necessity for maintaining the unification of the working class. The right wing of the Social-Democrats has coined slogans such as 'the third force,' 'people's capitalism,' and the 'benevolent state.' They support such features as the 'cold war' and the North Atlantic military pact, as well as the persistent tyranny observed in Southeast Asia. Under the aegis of Yugoslavia, revisionist elements ally themselves with the Social-Democrats to influence the working class. They veer away from the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism to satisfy their own interests."

The other article, "On the Old Revisionist Positions," by B. Ponomarev, F. Konstantinov, and Yu. Andropov, is taken from Kommunist (Moscow, No 8, May 1960 (pages 24-28). The article, which appears in Unen, 24, 25, and 26 June 1960, is an all-out attack on the Yugoslav Communist Party and on Tito's doctrines. It questions the theory and practice of socialism in Yugoslavia, charging that Titoist interpretations of contemporary international problems contain some of the worst aspects of revisionism, and that the situation in Yugoslavia is getting worse instead of better. It cites Titoist views against militant socialism as a typical example, asserting that these views indicate the growth of bourgeois philosophy in Yugoslavia. The authors call for greater Yugoslav solidarity within the socialist camp.

IV. NORTH VIETNAM

Peiping-Moscow Differences Ignored in Press

A survey of the available North Vietnamese press for the period 1 April to 22 June 1960 indicates that North Vietnam has taken no public notice of the recent expressions of ideological differences between Peiping and Moscow. Only four of the many articles and speeches by Chinese and Soviet spokesmen, around which the dispute has revolved, have been reported by the North Vietnamese press. These four were: Kuusinen's speech made on the 90th anniversary of Lenin's birth; Liu Shao-chi's speech at the banquet honoring the visiting Albanian delegation; Khrushchev's speech at the Rumanian Party Congress; and the resolution of the recent World Federation Trade Union meeting in Peiping. In each case, only a brief resume was given, which tended to avoid the key parts of the speech.

Statements made during the same period by North Vietnamese Communist leaders do not indicate that the regime has taken a position favoring either Communist China or the Soviet Union. Statements continue to express support for both Peiping and Moscow. For example, Premier and Politburo Member Pham Van Dong, at a banquet on 10 May honoring Chinese Premier Chou En-lai, is quoted in the 11 May issue of Nhan Dan as having said:

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"Along with the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic has always pursued a peaceful foreign policy,...has strengthened unity with all peace-loving people of the world according to the five principles of peaceful coexistence, while resolutely exposing and resisting the US imperialists' policy of aggression and war provocation." He added that North Vietnam too would do its part to promote peace and, "following the five principles of peaceful coexistence, would strengthen our friendship and cooperation with...countries all over the world."

Vice-Premier and Politburo Member Truong Chinh, speaking on 22 May to a rally of 170,000 Hanoi citizens who had massed to protest the US's "wrecking of the summit conference," is quoted in the 23 May Nhan Dan as having said: "It is worthy of note that despite the tremendous obstacles which the US imperialists have piled on the road to peace, the Soviet Union has constantly maintained its policy of peaceful coexistence and has struggled persistently and tirelessly to reach a settlement of international disputes through negotiations.... This correct attitude of the Soviet Union has won the admiration and approval of peace-loving people throughout the world."

In an article in the May 1960 issue of Hoc Tap, Truong Chinh stresses this idea, saying that the most important international duty of the Vietnamese revolution is to support the USSR, "the first proletariat in the world." He contends that this can be done peacefully because President Ho Chi Minh "agrees with the five principles of peaceful coexistence and regards them as the basis for building friendly relations with all neighboring countries and with all other countries, and as the means of keeping peace in Indochina and consolidating peace in Southeast Asia and throughout the world."

Statements made by President Ho Chi Minh at a banquet held in honor of Hadji Lechi, President of the National Assembly of the People's Republic of Albania, further attest to North Vietnam's adherence to the Soviet line. As reported in Nhan Dan on 13 June, President Ho stated: "Along with fraternal countries in the socialist bloc and peace-loving people throughout the world, Vietnam and Albania wholeheartedly support the correct and peaceful viewpoint of the USSR and its recent proposal for general and total disarmament."

Following the same line, President Lechi said: "The people of our two countries have unanimously supported and will always support the Leninist foreign policy of the Soviet Union and its proposal for general and total disarmament." He added that "the modern revisionists, the most dangerous of whom are the Yugoslavs, are a serious threat to the international Communist and workers movement...because they want to destroy the unity of the socialist bloc led by the USSR...they defend imperialism...and serve capitalism."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Domestically there are indications of some divergence of opinion over party economic policy. Until recently, the policy of the Lao Dong Party and especially of Ho Chi Minh was to give top priority to the development of agriculture and then to light industry; little mention was made of the development of heavy industry. According to press indications, Ho still adheres to this policy, although in an address to the Hanoi Municipal Party Congress on 20 June, as reported in the 21 June Nhan Dan, he mentioned that the development of heavy industry was essential to the building of socialism in North Vietnam. However, he did not dwell on the subject and this is his first mention of it observed in the press. In the January issue of Hoc Tap he had said: "We must develop agriculture to create conditions for national industrialization. Only when agriculture is strong can industry become strong."

Sources

Hoc Tap, monthly theoretical journal of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party, May 60

Hoc Tap Tai Lieu Dich, published by the Propaganda and Training Department of the Central Committee, May 60

Lao Dong, official organ of the Vietnam General Confederation of Labor, 1-30 Apr 60

Nghien Cuu Van Hoc, published by the Literary Institute of the State Science Commission, Jan, Apr, May 60

Nhan Dan, daily organ of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party, 1 Apr-22 Jun 60

Quan Doi Nhan Dan, official organ of the Vietnam People's Army, 1 Apr-23 Jun 60

Thoi Moi, independent daily, 1 Apr-9 Jun 60

Thoi Su Pho Thong, probably published by the Lao Dong Party primarily for Cadre Training, No 9, 1960

Thudo Hanoi, independent daily, 1 Apr-14 May 60

Van Hoc, official organ of the Vietnam Literary Association, 13, 16, 20, 27 May 60; 3, 10 Jun 60

Van Nghe, official organ of the Vietnam Arts and Letters Association, Mar, Apr, May, Jun 60

Van Nghe Quan Doi, published by the Vietnam People's Army, May, Jun 60

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Part 3. EASTERN EUROPE

Evidences of revisionist currents were noted in Bulgarian, East German, Hungarian, and Rumanian publications and took the form of domestic application of a Lenin treatise and attacks on distortions of basic Marxist theory in the ideological and cultural fields. While the Bulgarian press avoided foreign applications in its review of Lenin's treatise on left-wing Communism, Hungarian and Rumanian organs evoked the specter of Yugoslav revisionism, offering as justification concern for domestic ideological and cultural purity; Hungary related this threat specifically to the phenomenon of modernism. In addition to modernism, the revisionist denial of the class struggle was also the object of Hungarian attack. A similar concern over departure from basic Marxist tenets was manifested in an East German criticism of a new work by the accused revisionist philosopher, Ernst Bloch.

I. BULGARIA

For information on revisionism in Bulgaria, see "Bulgarian Press Reviews Lenin's Treatise on Radicalism," Summary No 2637, Eastern Europe Press Survey (109).

II. EAST GERMANY

For information on revisionism in East Germany, see "Renewed Criticism Erupts Over New Publication by East German Revisionist Philosopher, Ernst Bloch," Summary No 2637, Eastern Europe Press Survey (109).

III. HUNGARY

Hungarian Attacks on Modernism May Be Motivated Partly by Fears of Yugoslav Revisionism

A long debate on the problem of modernism, previously carried on by critics who were divided on definitions of and orientations toward this phenomenon, has now been virtually ended in Hungary by uncompromising attacks on modernism for its world-view content -- a content which, according to the official spokesmen, includes existentialism, narodnikism, and nearly all types of bourgeois and revisionist views. In the June 1960 issue of the Hungarian literary monthly Kortars, in the midst of a long and complex review of modernism and short-story writing in Hungary, Andras Dioszegi, an author who had been favorably inclined toward modernism

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

earlier, includes in his discussion of the background of the problem a reference to Yugoslav revisionist ideas on "alienation." Pertinent excerpts from this article appear below. (For fuller treatment of the attacks on modernism in the Hungarian debate, see Summary No 2650, Eastern Europe Press Survey (111), Item B-1.)

"...From the 'artistic' viewpoint these writers could be followers of various traditions. They could be 'neorealists,' 'neoclassicists,' 'reists,' or 'analysts,' or even 'traditionalists,' but the end result is the same: the 'modernist' attitude screens a rather marked world-view position.... We can see that when a modernizing novella insists on its 'modernness,' then political naivetes, narodnik illusions, and opposition negativism resound within it. Of course, all this is dispersed, but much is thus betrayed of the true source of 'modernism.'

"To sum up: modernism is the chief form for spreading world-view uncertainty in our literature.... The most varied ideas, views, and philosophies can fit together in it.... Modernism is the chief form for expressing world-view third-roadism both in Western literature and in our literature.... And we would like to emphasize that uncertainty is harmful primarily to artistic production itself....

"What is the background for this spreading of uncertainty?... It is striking that what our young writers take over from our critical realists, or rather from contemporary Western modernists, is often very superficial.... And this is not by chance; we might say it is necessary. The young novella writers, suffering in crisis, in thematic and world-view disorientation,... are really undertaking to expose such conflicts as were presented to writers of the past or writers living in Western, capitalist countries of today.... But our contemporary socialist reality (even if numerous traces of the past still live in human consciousness) is a radically different reality from that which Western prose wants to reflect 'objectively.'...

"From the viewpoint of epic portrayals, the most important 'thesis' of the revisionist argument is that human relationships were so lastingly deformed by the capitalist society that these deformed relationships still reign in socialism, in our daily life. The aesthetic consequence of this conception is that even in socialism, in the transitional world, some sort of adapted form of critical realism is timely, and it is the most important function of the epic to describe the deformations and to contribute with its 'awakening of awareness' to the overcoming of them. This aesthetic discusses the 'phenomenon of alienation' as the phenomenon of life which characterizes both capitalism and socialism; this 'phenomenon of alienation' degrades man into an 'abstract' being. Most recently, the Hungarian language journal Híd, published in Yugoslavia, gave a pregnant expression to this conception, coming to the conclusion that the most

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

important aspiration of socialist prose today is to attack the 'problem of alienation' with literary tools. 'To apprehend with abstract tools, with philosophy, the man who has become abstract, this has become the goal and method of the writers.' We have already described the Hungarian equivalent of this conception....

"Thus, it is not by chance that we form a different opinion. According to our conception: as in life so in artistic works also, to seek and reinstate the normal human relationships...."

Other Articles

Additional information on revisionism may be found in the following articles:

"Hungarians Shift Ground in Literary Debate, Modernism Becomes Chief Ideological Enemy," Summary No 2625, Eastern Europe Press Survey (108).

"Hungarian Ideologist Attacks Revisionist Denial of Class Struggle," Summary No 2644, Eastern Europe Press Survey (110).

IV. RUMANIA

Press Elaborates on Soviet Attack on Yugoslav Revisionism

The May 1960 issue of Lupta de Clasa, theoretical and political journal of the Rumanian Workers Party, contains the full text of an article in issue No 8, 1960, of the Soviet Kommunist which criticizes as revisionist the recent Fifth Congress of the Socialist Association of Working People of Yugoslavia.

On 5 June, Scinteia, the Rumanian central party organ, expressed complete agreement with the Kommunist attack and scored the Yugoslav leaders for their "nonbloc" position. Although the Scinteia article reiterates the importance, for Rumanian-Yugoslav relations, of "respect for mutual interests between states and noninterference in internal affairs," it emphasizes that "it is the duty of all Communists to fight resolutely against manifestations of bourgeois ideology, against all attempts to distort the revolutionary theory of the working class." The following excerpts contain the details of the Rumanian elaboration.

"Protecting the purity of Marxist-Leninist teaching and combating all manifestations of bourgeois ideology and of reformist and revisionist theories are permanent tasks of great significance in the ideological activity of Communist and workers parties. The declaration of the 1957

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

conference of Communist and workers parties in Moscow emphasized particularly that, at present, revisionism is the principal danger against which the attention and vigilance of the international workers movement should be directed.

In the field of combating revisionism in the international workers movement, let us point out the valuable article which appeared in the most recent issue (No 8) of the review Kommunist, theoretical and political organ of the Central Committee CPSU, entitled 'From Old Revisionist Positions' and written by B. Ponomarev, F. Konstantinov, and I. Andropov. This article is an analysis of the work of the Fifth Congress of the Socialist Association of Working People of Yugoslavia, held in Belgrade 18-22 April 1960.

"Characterized by a high-principled position, by profound, scientific argumentation, the article makes a valuable contribution toward clarifying fundamental questions of theory and practice in the international workers movement, around which contemporary revisionism is trying to sow the seeds of confusion.

"As we know, the Communist and workers parties all over the world have unanimously rejected and condemned revisionist concepts which have been expressed in the program of the Association of Communists of Yugoslavia. The article discloses, on the basis of an analysis of the work of the congress [of the Socialist Association of Working People] that 'the Yugoslav leaders not only failed to draw conclusions from the criticism of the program of the Association of Communists made by the Marxist-Leninist parties, but continue to accentuate their revisionist concepts, estranging themselves more and more from positions of the international Communist movement and from Marxism-Leninism.'

"The principal aim of the Fifth Congress was, as the article has shown, the glorification and further development of the revisionist program of the Association of Communists. The organizers of the congress wanted, clearly, to give the congress a great international resonance. The fact that 40 foreign delegates participated in the congress was interpreted by the Yugoslav press to mean that world public opinion was showing great interest in and approving the program proposed by the Yugoslav revisionists.

"However, the same press omitted the fact that approval came from the representatives of the social democratic parties and the bourgeois nationalist parties..., politicians known for their ferocious anti-Communism. The interests of international socialism, the interests of the entire workers and democratic movement (the article pointed out) demand that the revisionist concepts which were popularized at the Fifth Congress of the Socialist Association of Working People of Yugoslavia under the banner of 'creative Marxism' be decisively criticized as a new offensive against principles of Marxism-Leninism...."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Scinteia then gives an extensive summary and discussion of points from the Kommunist article. It continues:

"The congress again gave much importance to the 'nonbloc policy' promoted by Yugoslavia. The Rumanian Workers Party has taken a stand in respect to this concept, expressing its disagreement in a number of articles published in Scinteia and Lupta de Clasa. These articles analyzed the erroneous, injurious content of the theses propagated by the Yugoslav revisionists in questions such as the unity of the socialist camp and the international Communist movement and the united struggle of the anti-imperialist forces which have declared themselves in favor of peace. These articles have shown that the attempt to consider existing groups of states equal has the obvious purpose of dulling the edge of the struggle against the policy of aggressive imperialist circles which bear the whole responsibility for tension in international relations....

"In the report presented to the congress, President Tito acknowledged that the socialist countries are menaced by threats from capitalist countries. The natural conclusion which every Marxist should draw from this is the necessity of strengthening the cohesion and solidarity of socialist countries by all possible methods and of being ready to give a decisive reply to all attempts of imperialists to discredit their great achievements. But the Yugoslav leaders have not reached such a conclusion. As the Kommunist article has pointed out, they attribute identical purposes to all groups of states, thereby justifying their unwillingness to march along with the countries of the socialist camp, their refusal to participate in the international solidarity of the socialist countries.

"In a speech delivered after the publication of the Kommunist article, after the indignation at the provocative policy of aggressive US circles had become known all over the world, President Tito, speaking about 'who especially is to blame' for the failure of the summit conference mentioned 'the case of that unfortunate plane which involves an unallowable policy in an especially difficult situation.' Tito continued: 'It is a matter of the action of elements lacking a sense of responsibility, approved, unfortunately, by the American government.' The President of the US declared that it was a question of a deliberated policy which will continue into the future, while the President of Yugoslavia reduces it entirely to an 'unfortunate' case. This is an obvious attempt to lessen the responsibility of initiators of policies disturbing and aggravating the international situation....

"To give a more attractive appearance to their 'nonbloc' position, which is enjoying less and less confidence from public opinion, the Yugoslav leaders present it sometimes under the name of the policy of 'active peaceful coexistence.' The truth is, however, that...they have estranged themselves completely from the Marxist-Leninist concept of the problem of peaceful coexistence and the actual ways of assuring it.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

"Marxist-Leninists consider that respect for peaceful coexistence is a vital objective necessity, but this does not mean the lessening of the contradictions between socialism and capitalism; it does not mean the cessation of the historic competition for the victory of the new, socialist social order; it does not mean any conciliation in the field of ideology. Peaceful coexistence, understood in the Leninist manner, means the permanent unmasking of imperialism and of reactionary forces and the intransigent fight against bourgeois ideology....

"The Kommunist article emphasizes that the progress of [USSR-Yugoslav] relations depends on the Yugoslav leaders. The same thing may be said about relations between Yugoslavia and Rumania. Guided by the interests of peace and socialism, Rumania consistently promotes the policy of developing Rumanian-Yugoslav relations on the basis of respecting mutual interests and of noninterference in the internal affairs of the other state....

"In combating revisionist theories, the Communist and workers parties are guided by the principles of internationalism, by the fundamental interests of the cause of socialism and peace. It is in this spirit that the article we are reviewing was written. The official Yugoslav press, as has been its custom, has tried to represent the high-principled, scientifically based positions taken in the study and the sound arguments employed as 'an attack for the purpose of distorting the spirit and goals of Yugoslav policy,' according to the weekly organ of the Association of Communists of Yugoslavia....

"Care for the purity of Marxist-Leninist education and its protection against all distortions and against all opportunistic, revisionist infiltrations are permanent tasks of our party. It is a duty of all Communists to fight resolutely against manifestations of bourgeois ideology, against all attempts to distort the revolutionary theory of the working class, i.e., Marxism-Leninism."

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Part 4. WESTERN EUROPE

BELGIUM

Belgian Communist Party Accused of Opportunism; Politburo Member Admits
Dogmatism-Hinders Building of Socialism

That the Communist Party of Belgium published articles criticizing the Central Committee's activity report (excerpts of which appeared in Selected Translations on International Communist Developments, No 8, JPRS 3151, 28 March 1960), published in the 26 January 1960 issue of Le Drapeau Rouge, Brussels Communist daily, and its draft theses for the 13th Party Congress, 16-18 April 1960, was in itself not unusual, for it has, publicly at least, encouraged constructive criticism in the past. However, its publication, in the 5 April issue of Le Drapeau Rouge, of a highly critical article by Henri Glineur, identified as a Central Committee member representing the Charleroi Federation, might be termed generous. Interestingly, Glineur does not appear to have been re-elected to the Central Committee, at least according to the list of members published in Le Drapeau Rouge of 19 April.

Glineur first criticized the theses for limiting the means of transition to socialism in Belgium to one -- peaceful. Next he criticized certain party tactics. And finally, he denounced the over-all content of the activity report as being devoted exclusively to economic and social subjects. He singled out several main issues which he claimed the report either failed to include at all or approached incorrectly.

To say, as did the theses, that "socialism will occur when the majority of Belgian citizens want it, on the basis of the widest alliance of the working class, the farmers, the small businessmen, artisans, small industrialists, and intellectuals" is being idealistic, he said, and he cited a prediction allegedly made to him by one Jean Prolo to the effect that several generations will have to pass before the majority of the Belgians can be rallied to socialism. To back up his statement that anticipating a "single way for the transition to socialism is...a fundamental error," and that a peaceful transition depends not on the Communists but on the bourgeoisie, Glineur referred to the 20th Congress of the CPSU which, he said, stressed just that. The Belgian draft theses, Glineur continued, are limited to the belief or hope that the "monopolistic bourgeoisie will be 'intelligent' enough to capitulate at the opportune moment." Anyone who is slightly familiar with the parliamentary history of Belgium and with the system of electoral alliances practiced there will realize, said Glineur, that prospects for mobilizing the masses are not encouraging. There is, he said, a "stench of opportunism" in these appraisals.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

To further support his stand that Belgian Communists must be prepared for the passage to socialism by any means, Glineur quoted from an article by D. Shevlyagin in the March 1958 issue of Cahiers du Communisme, French Communist Party monthly theoretical journal (a translation of an article entitled "The Struggle of the Fraternal Communist Parties Against Opportunism" in Kommunist, (Moscow), No 18, 1957) which said that Communists must not limit the possibility of democratic development of capitalism toward socialism exclusively to peaceful means; but must be prepared to use force if those who oppose the "will of the majority of the peoples" provoke it.

The second part of Glineur's article dealt with what he termed "tactical" errors in several areas of importance to the Belgian party. While admitting that he is more than ever "convinced of the urgent necessity" for the Central Committee's unitary political line, Glineur bluntly stated that he is "not of the opinion that a greater effort to convince [the masses of the merits of socialism] has been made by the Central Committee and the Politburo." He agreed with the principle that Belgian Communists running for public office should withdraw from elections in favor of other candidates when there is no chance of their own election, but cautioned that withdrawals such as those in certain regions in the 1958 elections, where Communists withdrew in favor of Socialist candidates at a time when the Socialist Party was in power, are only self-defeating. He complained that many of the Communist candidates did not differentiate in their withdrawals between the "inveterate rightists" and the "leftist" elements of the Belgian Socialist Party, and that the Belgian Communist Party did not even ask the candidates it was asking the people to support to issue a statement of agreement with the Communist electoral program. Glineur further complained that the party failed to thoroughly analyze the results of the elections, which omission, he said, led to confusion and skepticism among many party members and among the many non-Communists who voted for Communist candidates.

Glineur's second tactical criticism concerned the party's attitude toward "full employment." All Belgian parties are in favor of full employment, Glineur said, but he stressed that not all parties are using the term in the same way. The Communist Party certainly does not agree with those who say that there is full employment when 60,000 or 70,000 persons are without work, he said, but it has never said exactly what it means by the term. Repeated requests for precision on this matter went unanswered, he complained.

Glineur concluded his article with general remarks about subjects discussed either not at all or, in his opinion, incorrectly in the Central Committee's activity report. The active role played by Communists in municipal affairs and in groups of patriots, resistance fighters, and political prisoners for the defense of their rights is not even mentioned in the report, Glineur complained. He granted that Communist activities

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

in trade unions, which the report did discuss, are of unquestionable importance, but he continued, "it appears, in reading the report, that Communists have been active in this sector only." He did admit, however, that the prospects outlined in the theses for this (1960) congress are much more extensive than all the activities described in the report, but stressed that the only way to win the Belgian people over to the Communist cause is to follow Lenin's advice contained in his book "What Is to Be Done" to the effect that the Communists must go to the people in order to create a "political awareness" in them, and must send "detachments of their army in all directions."

While Henri Glineur accused the Communist Party of Belgium of opportunism, which may have been responsible for his being dropped as a member of the Central Committee, Jean Terfve, member of the Politburo, admitted that dogmatism is the party's main problem. His blunt speech on dogmatism to the 13th Congress, which was presented with the explanation that in celebration of the 90th anniversary of Lenin's birth the party wished to reaffirm its attachment to Marxism-Leninism, was printed in the 22 April 1960 issue of Le Drapeau Rouge. The party's great concern over dogmatism in its ranks had previously been expressed on 2 December 1958, when the newspaper published a long article by Gerard Van Moerkerke, Central Committee member, entitled "The Netherlands Communist Party and Its Struggle for the Leninist Unity of the Party," in which dogmatism, not revisionism, was posed as the main threat to the Belgian party. A summary of this article appeared in International Communist Developments (90), Summary No 2024, 6 January 1959.

In his speech, which the newspaper titled "Lenin, Guide of the Communists," Terfve referred to Ernest Burnelle's activity report. This report admitted that although the party has made great progress in its fight against the dogmatism and schematism which had hindered its struggle to build socialism in Belgium, there is much work to be done to make it a party "such as Lenin correctly thought of it." Stressing the party's "attachment to Marxism-Leninism" throughout his speech, Terfve admitted that the party has sometimes "applied theory too mechanically" and has viewed Marxism-Leninism "more as a sort of revealed truth than as a method of investigation, research, and action." But, he added, the fact that for 6 years the party has been carrying on a "systematic fight against this deviation" and has tried to "eliminate schematism and dogmatism in our ranks" gives it the right to openly discuss this problem. He further gave credit to the writings of Lenin which "enabled us to become Communist men once again."

In what may have been an attempt to answer past or possible future criticism for too much reliance on Moscow in striving to build socialism in Belgium, Terfve explained that by giving the Belgian workers movement "the experiences and teachings of the struggle of the international revolutionary workers movement" the Belgian party is putting at the

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

disposal of the Belgian workers the "immense arsenal of means which have enabled numerous countries to eliminate capitalism as a ruling form...." He quoted Lenin to back up his statement that the Belgian Communists must imitate Moscow, but "must never forget the special circumstances of our country which must find their integral expression in the details of our program." He stressed that the "experience of the entire workers movement" must be used as a guide in elaborating the Belgian party's organization and tactics, but only as a guide, for "there is no ready-made model." He admitted that the party's program is not perfect, and added that it is up to each party member to help perfect it.

Terfve devoted a few paragraphs to the colonial question and to the Congo in particular, admitting that up to recent times, the party had a "theoretical attitude" toward its importance. He even admitted the possibility that the "quietude of the bourgeoisie" about the Congo question "had rubbed off on the party," but added that "happily, we awoke before it was too late."

Terfve concluded with an interesting acknowledgment of the CPSU delegation attending the congress for the portrait of Lenin which it had presented to the Belgian party. Saying that the Soviet delegation "was considerate enough" to present the portrait, Terfve stated, "We see in this gesture much more than a gift. We take it as fraternal advice, as an invitation to follow the path pointed out by the one who, after founding the first socialist state the world had ever known, at the same time pointed out the prospects which will ensure the triumph of Communism everywhere. We accept the advice," said Terfve, "and will do all in our power to be worthy of the great Lenin."

* * *

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Approved For Release 2000/09/14 : CIA-RDP78-00915R001200120004-1

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Approved For Release 2000/09/14 : CIA-RDP78-00915R001200120004-1